

13X 8711
W 6

REMARKS
ON
SEVERAL COMMON ERRORS
CONCERNING THE
WRITINGS OF EMANUEL SWEDENBORG;
CONTAINED PRINCIPALLY
IN TWO PAMPHLETS,
WHICH ARE USED FOR OPPOSING
THE NEW JERUSALEM.

BY SAMUEL WORCESTER.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY JOHN ALLEN, NO. 11, SCHOOL STREET.
1832.



REMARKS
ON
SEVERAL COMMON ERRORS
CONCERNING THE
WRITINGS OF EMANUEL SWEDENBORG;
CONTAINED PRINCIPALLY
IN TWO PAMPHLETS,
WHICH ARE USED FOR OPPOSING
THE NEW JERUSALEM.

BY SAMUEL WORCESTER.

✓ BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY JOHN ALLEN, NO. 11, SCHOOL STREET.

1832.



ex.

EX/8711-
V/6

PRINTED BY I. R. BUTTS.....BOSTON.

P R E F A C E.

THE first Pamphlet to which these remarks refer, contains some serious allegations against the receivers of the writings of Swedenborg, which it seems most proper to notice in a Preface. The Pamphlet has the following title-page :

“ The principal Doctrines of the New Jerusalem Church, contained in fortytwo articles, with references, carefully selected, from the Theological Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg. Published in London, in 1788. By a Committee of the New Jerusalem Church, London. With Extracts from his Treatise on the Pleasures of Insanity, concerning Scortatory Love. First American Edition. 1820.”

The first paragraphs of the Introduction are as follow :

1. “ The followers of Emanuel Swedenborg, in various parts of this country, are discovering peculiar zeal to disseminate his doctrines, and to make proselytes to the faith which they have embraced. Of this no one, perhaps, could reasonably complain ; if the measures adopted to accomplish the object in view were strictly fair, and indicative of ‘ godly sincerity.’ The scheme extensively pursued, is the following. Small detached portions of the writings of Swedenborg are printed by themselves, and widely circulated. These portions are always the least offensive and exceptionable parts of his works ; usually some of his Commentaries on the Scriptures, giving what is called the *internal sense*, or a *spiritual interpretation* of their contents. These are put into the hands of the noviciate ; and he does not know that anything of a dif-

ferent character is to succeed them. When he has perused these, he is furnished with other and larger portions of the same general nature, but disclosing somewhat more fully the nature of the system. It is not, however, until he is well initiated; until his mind, by frequently contemplating the less gross and ridiculous parts of the system, is prepared to look with composure at the rest; that its more absurd and disgusting features are exhibited.

2. "This mode of endeavoring to disseminate the principles of Swedenborg, should we even admit them to be true, is unjustifiable; and proves that those who are concerned in it have derived little benefit from his writings. If anything is pre-eminently necessary to the character of virtue, it is *rectilinear integrity*. *To do evil that good may come*, is a principle of action wholly abhorrent to the spirit of Christianity. St. Paul pronounces the condemnation of those persons to be just, who even *reported* that he and his brethren were governed by it."

The author then states that, "it is to counteract the mischievous effects of these unlawful measures, that the following pamphlet is published."

The reader will here inquire who brings these accusations against the members of the New Church; and whether the author, in thus opposing the New Church, has set an example of that "*rectilinear integrity*," which he so justly approves. It will be obvious to every one, that those who bring accusations, and especially those of a personal character, against any class of men, should give their own names, and make themselves in all respects responsible for the truth of their statements. In the pamphlet before us, the name of the compiler, the publisher, the printer, and the place of publication, are all omitted. It is said to be the "First American Edition;" and from the placing of this at the bottom of the title-page, the only fair inference is, that the whole pamphlet was first printed in a foreign country. There was a peculiar anxiety manifested when the pamphlet was first printed, to preserve secrecy in relation to its

origin; and the same disposition appears even at this day. There are probably very few persons who know where or by whom it was compiled; and it appears never to have been published, or exposed for public sale. It has been very extensively circulated in a secret manner; and so far as the members of the New Church can discover, it has been, and still is, the principal engine that is made use of in New England, to oppose the doctrines which they profess. A new pamphlet has been issued in a manner somewhat similar; and, thus, there is too much reason for supposing that this secret mode of warfare is deliberately adopted by the opponents of the New Church. Can it be doubted that it would have the salutary effect of making them more reasonable, and more careful in respect to the truth of their statements, if they would "come to the light," and write as those "who must give an account?"

This is not designed to imply that I have any disposition to enter into a controversy with any member of the Old Church. No one can desire it less; but if publications are issued against the New Church, which demand a reply, I wish to know *whence they come*, that I may be the better enabled to *show whither they go*; and I believe that the cause of truth and honest dealing, and a due regard to the good of the writers themselves, render it proper for members of the New Church to protest against this secret warfare. That the readers of this first pamphlet may hereafter have the benefit of such names as the compiler and printer should have given, I shall state some facts, which I suppose to be susceptible of legal proof.

It was compiled by the Rev. John W. Ellingwood,

of Bath, in the state of Maine. Mr. Ellingwood is the minister of the North Church, or society of Calvinistic Congregationalists, in that town. He collected the books from which the extracts were made, and took the leading part in compiling the pamphlet.

The "Introduction" has been ascribed to different individuals. Several of the "Orthodox," and some of other sects, have said that it was written by Rev. Mr. Dwight, formerly minister of Park Street Church, Boston. I suppose this to be true, but cannot affirm it. If Mr. Ellingwood compiled the pamphlet, and put it into the hands of any person, requesting or consenting, then or afterward, that additions should be made to it, he may fairly be regarded as responsible for the whole; but of this I willingly leave the reader to form his own opinion. It is, however, certain that Mr. Ellingwood and several of his church, have been very busy in circulating the pamphlet with its "Introduction."

It was printed, not published, by Messrs. Crocker & Brewster, of Boston. The printing was paid for by about a dozen members of the two "Orthodox" churches in Bath. The names of most of these persons are before me, but there seems to be no need of publishing them.

It thus appears that the "First American Edition" of this pamphlet was simply the *first edition*. It has been very extensively circulated, and I should suppose there had been many thousand copies; but the first edition is said to have consisted of only one thousand, and all the copies that I have seen are dated "1820."

When it first appeared, it produced considerable sensation among the connexions of those who belong to the New Church. Many were anxious to know whether

the statements there made were correct. The answer uniformly given, was in the negative. A little discussion on the subject also appeared in one of the Boston newspapers. The members of the New Church are generally averse to controversy ; and their principles forbid *doing evil that good may come, and rendering evil for evil*. Considered in relation to ourselves, we should not be likely to think any misstatements called for a reply ; but when they lead others to form erroneous opinions concerning the doctrines of the New Jerusalem, which have been revealed from heaven, and excite such enmity as closes their minds against the true light ; and especially when such misstatements are long and frequently repeated, and are industriously circulated as true and just, we may sometimes think it proper to contradict them, and substitute truth for falsity.

The duty, which I have assumed, of replying to this pamphlet, is rendered peculiarly unpleasant and difficult by the nature of the principal subject, by the style of the attack, and by the vigilant efforts of the friends of the pamphlet, to deter others from reading those works which state truly the heavenly doctrines of the New Jerusalem. For many things that I state, the reader can have no direct evidence but my assertion ; and this will unavoidably deny in explicit terms the solemn assertions of the pamphlet. But the reader will be so good as to bear in mind, that I have been well known as openly professing and teaching the truths of the New Church for sixteen years ; that no one was more active in disseminating them when this pamphlet was compiled ; that there is probably no person in the United States, whose opportunities have been greater for knowing the manner

in which these doctrines are disseminated, and the opinions of those who receive them, concerning the subjects treated of in this pamphlet; and that I give my name, and make myself responsible for my statements.

It is my purpose to avoid everything like harsh censure, recrimination, and unkindness; and if the reader discovers anything of this kind, I beg that he will not be pleased with it, nor attempt to justify it, but cast it away as evil.

The accusations against the members of the New Church, respecting their manner of circulating the works of Swedenborg, have already been quoted, with the exception of one, viz. that the work from which the "EXTRACTS" were made, is said to be "*the last of his treatises put into the hands of the young disciple.*" p. 5. If the reader will be so good as to look back to these accusations and observe them distinctly, he shall immediately have a direct answer to them.

I have had abundant means of knowing, and have taken special pains to ascertain, whether any such mode of disseminating these doctrines is practised; and the truth is, that no such practice has existed in America or in England, and I have no reason to suppose it ever existed in any country. From the time that the several works of Swedenborg were first printed, they were regularly published and exposed for sale; and as fast as they were translated, they were all advertised in catalogues on the covers of each, in the public papers, in separate catalogues, and in New Church magazines. The English editions were first used in America. In these, and in many of those which have been reprinted in America, similar catalogues have appear-

ed. One of the first that was re-printed, was that from which the "EXTRACTS" were made. This and all the others, as fast as they were translated, have been constantly exposed for public sale in this country for forty years. Several persons that I have known, were first introduced to that very book. Neither that nor any other has ever been kept back. Those who wish to read these works, generally select for themselves. We have always loaned them all, and spoken of them all freely. If at any time we recommend any, we are likely to select such as we suppose will be most intelligible and useful to the reader. This selection is commonly determined by some inquiries or remarks on some religious subject, which make it proper for us to refer to what Swedenborg teaches. We urge nothing, and conceal nothing ; but we preserve the freedom of every one as much as possible, and avoid as much as possible the common modes of proselyting.

I do not mean to say, that no individual of those who profess to receive the writings of Swedenborg, has ever done wrong in relation to the point of these accusations ; but I do say that examples of such wrong cannot have been common at any time, and that the receivers of the writings of Swedenborg have always been strongly opposed to all arts and stratagem in disseminating what they believe to be truths.

If I can do it without its appearing invidious, I shall like to inquire of the compiler and friends of this pamphlet, whether they have not adopted just such measures for deterring the public from examining the works of Swedenborg, as they charge us with adopting to promote the reading of them ? They charge us with cir-

culating small detached portions of his works which are the "least offensive and exceptionable," and withholding the complete views of the system, till the readers have become somewhat seasoned to this great wickedness. Now, have not the opponents of these doctrines printed small detached portions of these works, — and such as they regarded most "offensive and exceptionable," — and added censorious remarks, and put forth their pamphlet as giving a fair view of the writings of Swedenborg? And did they not mean thereby to deter others from reading these works? And is not this pamphlet now used by several sects as the principal means of checking the progress of the New Church? And is not this done, although it is well known to the intelligent of all these sects, that all members of the New Church utterly deny the fairness and correctness of its statements?

I have thus endeavored fairly and mildly to repel this attack on the characters of those who believe and circulate the writings of Swedenborg. These remarks apply to their conduct in only one particular. In this and all other respects, their characters are open to the judgment of Heaven and earth; and I well know that they have nothing of which they can boast, nor for which they should be complimented. I can only wish that they were better, and express a hope that they are in the way of gradual improvement.

REMARKS ON THE FIRST PAMPHLET.

HAVING noticed in the preceding Preface that part of the Introduction to Mr. Ellingwood's pamphlet which relates personally to those who believe and circulate the writings of Swedenborg, I now pass to the first article which follows the Introduction, and which is denoted in the title page by the "Principal Doctrines of the New Jerusalem Church."

This is an abstract statement made by certain members of the New Church in England; and, like most other things, is capable of being turned either to a good or an evil purpose. To those who have considerable knowledge of the truths of the New Church, it may be useful, as presenting in a very concise form the sum of what they believe on the various topics there enumerated; and from general ideas their minds may be led to the particulars of which these are composed. To others it can give scarcely any information concerning the Heavenly Doctrines of the New Jerusalem; and if any are made to believe that it gives anything like a fair and competent view of them, they are led into a great error. These doctrines are derived from the Word, opened and illustrated as to its internal senses; and they cannot be well understood except by those who read the Word in

the light of these internal senses. A boy who should undertake to learn Addition, would be very little assisted by being shown the sum or amount of various large numbers. He would need to learn the value of the numbers separately, and the mode of combining them, and then he might understand what was meant by their amount. It is so with these doctrines, or articles of faith; and those who know nothing of the faith of this church, except what they learn from these, are scarcely one degree removed from total ignorance. If the public were as ignorant of Calvinism as they are of the doctrines of the New Jerusalem, would Mr. Ellingwood, or any person who circulates this pamphlet, think that a fair view, or indeed any distinct view at all, could be presented in seven small pages. And, yet, it is a very common impression among the readers of this pamphlet, that it really gives them a competent view of the New Church system. Such is the tendency of the pamphlet to deceive.

There is not, however, much consistency prevailing on this point. The charge at one time is, that this system is wholly mysterious; at another, that it is embraced in so many ponderous volumes, that few can have time or patience to obtain a good knowledge of it; at another, that this little pamphlet presents it fairly!

Concerning this part of the pamphlet the Introduction contains several remarks. It says — “by looking at the 7th section, the sober-minded reader will perceive that the doctrines of the *Trinity*, of the *Atonement*, of *Justification by Faith alone*, and of the *Resurrection of the body*, are discarded.”

This is not a fair statement. The section alluded to, speaks not of the doctrine of the *Trinity*, but of “THREE DIVINE PERSONS;” and not of the *resurrection of the body*, but of the “*resurrection of the MATERIAL body*.”

Swedenborg teaches that there is a Trinity in the Lord consisting of the Essential Divine, the Divine Human or the Lord's Glorious Body, and the Proceeding Divine or Divine Operation. The Essential Divine is the Father ; the Divine Human, or Glorious Body, is the Son ; and the Proceeding Divine, or Divine Operation, is the Holy Spirit. An image of this Trinity exists in every individual man. The soul of man corresponds to the Father ; his body, to the Son ; and his operation or life proceeding from this body, corresponds to the Holy Spirit. Thus, in relation to the Lord, the Father who is said to *dwell in Him* , is the Essential Divine, or Divine Soul ; the Son is the Divine Human or Glorious Body, in which that Soul dwells ; and the Holy Spirit is the Divine Life proceeding from the Divine Human.

This Trinity is in the Lord Jesus Christ. How can it be otherwise if Paul said truly, that " IN HIM DWELLETH ALL THE FULNESS OF THE GODHEAD BODILY ? "

Thus Swedenborg does not deny the doctrine of the Trinity, but he discards the doctrine of THREE PERSONS IN THE GODHEAD. Three *persons* are three *beings* —three distinct personal beings ; and however you may talk, preach, or write about it, you cannot, I think, conceive of three *Divine persons* , except as *three Gods* . It seems to me absolutely *impossible* for any one to conceive of three *Divine persons* , and believe in three *Divine persons* , otherwise than as *three Gods* . Now, the Heavenly Doctrines of the New Jerusalem teach that there is but ONE GOD — and that the Lord Jesus Christ is that ONE GOD — even *the true God and Eternal Life* .

In relation to the *Atonement* : It is really true, that the New Church do not believe this doctrine as it is taught by Calvinists. We do not believe that there are Three Gods, or Three Persons, in the Trinity ; and that one of

these Gods, or Persons, was angry with the human race on account of their sins, and sent another God or Person, or that another God or Person offered to come, and did come to appease his wrath ; and that the Second Person or God did suffer the punishment due to the whole human race on account of their sins, and thus appease the wrath of the First Person or God, and render him propitious towards *a part* of the human race. 'This whole theory of Atonement the New Church reject, and I hope they reject it fully and heartily.

But the New Church do believe in the doctrine of REDEMPTION. They believe that the one living and true God, "the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace," was pleased in His great mercy to *manifest himself in the flesh* — to become GOD WITH US — by assuming the human nature, and appearing in the world as a Man. They also believe that the Lord kept or fulfilled the whole law, or revealed truth, in this Humanity which He assumed ; and that He thereby overcame and put away all the hereditary evils and imperfections of the Humanity which He assumed, and put on, or substituted, in place of these evils and imperfections, Divine principles from His own Divinity—the Father who dwelt within him, till he was wholly glorified or made wholly Divine. They believe, therefore, in the Divinity of His Humanity or Body ; and do not, as others, believe that His Humanity is like the humanity of the sons of men. They also believe that while the Lord "was in all points tempted like as we are," and resisted and overcame all evil in Himself, and was thus "without sin," He also resisted and overcame all those evil spirits who caused the temptations ; and that He removed those evil spirits from the minds of men, executed a final judgment upon them, and consigned them to their own place. This is meant when the Lord is

spoken of as a Man of War, as going forth conquering and to conquer, as delivering His people from their enemies; and also when He is said to have cast out devils, and when He said, "*I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven,*" "*For judgment I am come into the world,*" "*Now is the judgment of this world, now shall the prince of this world be cast out.*" This reduction of all things to order in the spiritual world, is what is referred to in that very extensive class of texts in the Psalms and Prophets, where the Lord's temptations, combats with His enemies, and victories over them, are described.

The New Church also believe, that, by glorifying His Humanity, and becoming God and Man in one Divine Person, *in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily*, and by thus fulfilling the whole Word or Law in Himself, and conquering all His enemies, He actually wrought Salvation and Redemption for mankind. He thereby acquired power to succor those who are tempted, — to give men ability to repent and forsake their sins, and keep His commandments, and thus follow Him in the way in which He has gone before them, even the way of regeneration unto everlasting life.

They also believe, that the power, influence, and operation of the Lord upon men, whereby He redeems and saves them, is the Holy Spirit or Spirit of Truth proceeding from Himself; and that every right thought and affection, word and action of man, are to be ascribed to the operating goodness, wisdom, and power of the Holy Spirit. This is the doctrine of Redemption which the New Church substitute for the "orthodox" doctrine of Atonement.

And, as the doctrines of Three Persons or Gods in the Godhead, and of Atonement by vicarious punishment, are discarded by the New Church, so the other essential

article of modern "orthodoxy" is discarded also. The Lord came not to save men by *Faith alone*, but "*to bless them by turning them away every one from his iniquities ;*" — *to save them from their sins, — and to purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.*" He came to redeem them from their iniquities, to give them repentance, to manifest and do the truth, to give them power to become His friends by doing His commandments ; — hence He came TO PLACE MANKIND IN A CONDITION IN WHICH THEY CAN WORK OUT THEIR OWN SALVATION, WHILE HE, OF HIS OWN GOOD PLEASURE, WORKETH IN THEM TO WILL AND TO DO.

Thus it is made man's duty to *do* the truth, as much as to *believe* it, — to *keep* the commandments as much as to *know* them. To have faith *only* in the Lord Jesus Christ, is not what is required ; but to have faith in Him, and keep His commandments, are what is required ; and they *make man just, or justify him.*

As to the Rēsurrection, the doctrine of the New Jerusalem is, that there is a natural body, and a spiritual body ; and that the body which is sown, or laid in the earth, is not that which shall be raised ; but that the body which shall be raised, is the spiritual body, which also is the living principle in the natural body. It also teaches, that man rises with his spiritual body, and enters into the spiritual world, usually on the third day after his de-cease ; and that he has no further use for his material body.

The "Introduction" to this pamphlet also refers to that article in the Abstract of the Doctrines of the New Church, which enumerates those books in the Bible which are properly the Word ; and in the page of questions at the end of the pamphlet, is the following :

“Can those writings be inspired, or have any claim to belief, which not only deny the great doctrines of the Scriptures, but declare that one sixth of the Old Testament, and more than half of the New, does not belong to the Word of God?”

The members of the New Church are not accustomed to speak of the works of Swedenborg as *inspired*. This has been done by some, who meant only to express the idea that he wrote from heavenly light. But Swedenborg does not thus speak of his works: and as that term is most properly appropriated to such writings as were dictated by the Lord, without any modification by the rational and voluntary operation of the minds of the writers, it has an obvious tendency to mislead the mind when applied to the writings of Swedenborg. Those who wrote the Word, wrote from Inspiration; Swedenborg, the Apostles, and some others, wrote from Illustration or Illumination of the mind by heavenly light. Swedenborg wrote from more full Illustration than even the Apostles.

As to those parts of the Bible which the doctrine of the New Church does not admit to belong to the Word, it does not convey a correct idea to the minds of most persons, to say that the New Church do not regard them as inspired, or as belonging to the Word or Sacred Scripture. In relation to this subject a false impression is made by this pamphlet, and by the common remarks of the Old Church. By some this is doubtless done ignorantly, and not maliciously.

Take for example the Epistles of the Apostles. The New Church suppose that they were written by the Apostles; that the Apostles were enlightened by the Holy Spirit, and wrote honestly and truly according to the light which they possessed; and that their writings and

other instructions were adapted for the introduction and establishment of Christianity among the nations to which they were sent.

How much does this fall short of the belief of the different "orthodox" sects themselves, who seem to regard the Epistles as "the very cream of the Bible" — as truly the most important part of revelation? The New Church do not, indeed, hold that every sentence in the Epistles is certainly and necessarily correct. Indeed, I may say individually, that there are a few things in them, which seem to me incorrect, and others that are obscure and of a doubtful character. I suppose that Paul thought celibacy a more holy state than marriage; and that the destruction of the material heavens and earth, and the Second Coming of the Lord, were expected by Paul, Peter, John, and probably by all the Apostles, in their own day. I suppose they expected these events in their own day, when they wrote their Epistles. It also appears that their idea of the work of Redemption was somewhat indistinct; and the same is to be said of their idea of the unity of the Godhead in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ, although they appear to have sometimes had a correct and clear general view of this subject. The indistinctness of their views on these subjects, may, however, have been less in reality, than it is in appearance. They wrote to those who were very ignorant of spiritual things, and hence they could not bring out their own interior views clearly and fully; we are imperfectly acquainted with their language, and with the condition of things when they wrote; and our own minds are very imperfect, and may not see clearly what is, in reality, distinct and well expressed.

These remarks will probably appear very shocking to "orthodox" readers; but I am greatly mistaken if they

really ascribe to the Epistles more truth, or more importance, than I do, or than is generally done by the New Church. Take from the Epistles the few things which seem to me to be incorrect, and I place the remainder on as high ground generally, as Calvinists do; and some parts, especially all the quotations from the Word of the Old Testament and from the words of the Lord while in the world, I place on *infinitely higher* ground. Calvinists and all other sects of the Old Church give to the Epistles, and to the Bible generally, only one sense or meaning, which is the literal grammatical meaning. As a guide to the present "orthodox" view of this subject, I have now in mind Professor Stuart's articles on the Inspiration of the Sacred Scripture, in some of the first numbers of the Biblical Repository, published at Andover; and I may safely say, that he does not concede to any part of the Bible a higher degree of Inspiration — a greater fulness of true and important meaning, than Swedenborg and the members of the New Church generally, ascribe to the Epistles and to all other books within the Bible.

There is some difference between the ground of New Church faith in these writings, and the ground of Old Church faith. The New Church believe them because they can see that what they contain is true: the Old Church believe them more from confidence in the infallibility of the writers. But, on reading the most celebrated commentaries on these writings, I do not find even so full and spiritual a degree of truth ascribed to them, as I suppose they contain. Indeed, these commentaries, make them vapid, earthly, and sensual, compared with what I believe them to be; and really seem to reject their true life and meaning, and thereby render their *absolute authority* of little value.

The books which the doctrine of the New Jerusalem calls the Word or Sacred Scripture, are the following : Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, the two books of Samuel, the two books of Kings, the Psalms, all the Prophets, the four Gospels, and the Revelation. These are Divine Books, and hence they contain infinite Wisdom and Goodness. They come down in their literal sense to the grossest condition of man in this world ; but they contain within them the wisdom and love which angels receive, and which constitute the light and life of heaven. If man obeys that order of truth which he can now see in the Word, his mind is capable of receiving a higher order. " To him that hath, shall more be given, and he shall have abundance ; " and he may advance continually in truth and goodness, and be perpetually supplied from the inexhaustible treasures of the Word.

The Sacred Scripture is not a superficial book, as many imagine. To those who use the means of understanding it which the Lord has now mercifully provided, it teaches as much truth as they can bear without its injuring them ; and if they do the truth which they can now understand, their minds will be opened to behold more wondrous things in the Law. They will see new truths, and a higher meaning in all truths ; and thus they may advance forever. The means which the Lord has now provided for understanding the true spiritual and heavenly meaning of the Word, are to be found in the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg. Standing at a distance and ridiculing his mode of interpretation, does not qualify any one for understanding it ; nor will it be understood by those who read his works to cavil, and oppose them, and with a fixed determination to reject them. Man's freedom is not to be taken away by the descent of the

New Jerusalem from heaven; but men are to be responsible for their manner of treating its light. And there are many hindrances to passing its gates, — the principal of which, are “whatsoever defileth or worketh abomination, or maketh a lie.”

Another reference that is made in the “Introduction” to this Abstract of Doctrines is the following :

“That the New Jerusalem Church is the crown of all churches, because it worships one *visible* God.”

I know not what the readers of this pamphlet suppose the New Church mean by a *visible* God; but it is certain that a very false idea may naturally be received from the expression, and that the pamphlet does not guard against such false idea.

If the reader will recollect that the New Church believe that the Lord Jesus Christ is the One God, he will observe that the mind can form a distinct, determinate idea of Him. In believing Him to be God, our thoughts have a distinct object to rest upon; the eye of the soul can see this object: it is *visible* to the mind.

But when you try to think of a God who is not in a human form, and has no form or organization, the mind cannot see him; the thoughts have no object to rest upon; the eye of the soul looks at vacancy, and sees nothing. It is like looking with the natural eyes into the air, where there is no object in a visible form.

Believing the Lord Jesus Christ in His Divine Humanity or Glorious Body to be the true God, the New Church does therefore believe in and worship one God who is *visible* to the mind. The Old Church generally believe in a God who is without any form or body, or organization. When the mind is directed towards him it rests on no object; it can have no determinate idea of him. Now, this seems to me too quite nearly allied to atheism. I

can conceive of no belief in a God as an intelligent being — as a being who possesses attributes analogous to the human will and understanding, and hence wills or decrees, and knows, provides, and operates, without thinking of a *personal being*. An *impersonal God* seems to me to be nothing but a mere *imaginary entity* — a mere *somewhat* — an *indeterminate ideality*. And I can form no conception of a man's believing in and loving a being, of whom he does not allow himself to form any determinate idea.

We read in the first chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews — “When he bringeth in the First Begotten into the world, he saith, and let all the angels of God worship Him.” And again — “Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever.” This shows that the Lord Jesus Christ *sitteth on the throne* ; and we know that He is the JUDGE of all and the REDEEMER of all, — He *SITTETH ON THE THRONE* and is the LAMB. If we look at the Revelation, we shall find there also, that the angels of God worship Him — yea, all that are in heaven.

Now every one thinks of the Lord Jesus Christ as in a HUMAN FORM, and thus as *visible* : and if He has not hitherto been worshipped in the churches on earth, and if all the angels of heaven do worship Him, is it not conceivable that the New Jerusalem, by adopting this heavenly worship, will be brought into closer similitude and association with the angels, and become highly exalted in heavenly life, and be in reality the crown of all churches, because it worships one visible God ?

The next article in this pamphlet, consisting of a little more than two pages, is composed of quotations from the writings of Swedenborg, showing the expediency and necessity for a complete separation of the members of the New Church from the Old Church. These reasons are, of course, such as they should be, except that they can

serve as no reasons at all to those who do not belong to the New Church nor receive its doctrines, and cannot be understood and appreciated except by those who know and receive these truths: to those who do, and who may read this pamphlet, they are recommended for serious consideration.

I think it allowable also to add one reason which Swedenborg has not distinctly expressed, although I think it is involved in those which he has given. In giving this reason, however, I wish it to be distinctly understood that I speak as an individual, and not in the name of the New Church.

It is very common for the neighbors and former associates of members of the New Church, to complain that these members are accustomed to separate themselves, and keep at a distance from those who are devoted to the Old Church, and from those who are immersed in the love and pleasures of the world. I suppose this charge has some truth in it, and I wish it was more literally true.

When members of the New Church associate with those of the Old, they are usually the minority; the members of the Old understand not the principles and feelings of those of the New; no disposition is ever manifested to meet the members of the New Church on their own ground, and ignorance of their principles prevents it. For these reasons, whenever the usual social intercourse which prevails in the world is cultivated by a member of the New Church, he must of necessity meet the Old Church and the world on their own ground; and if there be an essential difference between his principles and theirs, he must leave his own and go to theirs, so far as he places himself on an equality with them, and enters into the common forms and spirit of intercourse with them.

This, however, is not the case when a member of the the New Church is invited to intercourse with the Old, or with the world generally, under such circumstances as give him an opportunity to speak and act freely according to his principles, or allow him to limit his intercourse by the degree in which others can receive him in his true character. Then he may, in the social sense, be regarded as truly on an equality with them ; but that equality which is produced by his abandoning his own proper character and principles, and adopting theirs during the period of the intercourse is not true equality. He places himself on their ground, and is their slave.

And this is the kind of intercourse with the Old Church and the world, for not holding which the New Church is censured. We are not blamed for neglecting so much to go among others in our true character, and manifesting New Church principles. Such association with them is not desired : if it were desired, and would really be agreeable to our neighbors, they would find members of the New Church sufficiently sociable.

When members of the New Church do leave their own ground and their own peculiar principles, and fall in with the social sphere, or the religious sphere, of others, the common remarks which follow are to this effect : — “ Why, I do not see that these New Church folks are different from others ; they pretend to something new and very important, but when we get at them we do not find anything of importance.” This is a sample of the most favorable remarks ; but it is not uncommon that every word and action of such members of the New Church is made the subject of scrutiny, and of taunting gossip.

Now, as it respects such members, I do not say that this treatment is too severe a punishment. If they go over to the principles, customs and style of others, how

can their true principles be seen at all ; and if they are judged, they must be judged from what they are at the time.

And why should they go back to their former habits — the habits of those who are not believers in these doctrines ? Is there any good to be gained by it, or is the mind always thrown into a bad state ? And are not the principles of the New Church always made the subject of scandal by such concessions to those who reject them ? If members of the New Church were fully actuated by love of doing good to those around them, I believe they would, as much as possible, limit their intercourse to what they could have in the full possession and open expression of New Church principles. And if it be true, that old things must pass away, and all things must be created anew, within man and without him, is there not good reason for separating from the former things and suffering them to pass away, that the New Jerusalem may come down from God out of heaven.

The receivers of the Doctrines of the New Jerusalem are regarded by the Old Church as only one of the numerous sects of the First Christian Church ; but the members of the New Church regard the doctrines which they receive, as a new dispensation of truth from heaven. They cannot, therefore, place any other doctrines on an equality with these, nor admit that a true Church can be formed by the belief and profession of any others. They do not doubt that some degree of good and truth may be received, and that persons may be saved, without knowing even that the Doctrines of the New Jerusalem have been given ; and they can indulge a perfectly tolerant spirit towards all classes of religionists. Still, they cannot regard the Old Church and the world as holding the Doctrines of the true Christian religion ; and cannot

with propriety recognise any communion of belief, except so far as the common false doctrines are rejected, and those of the New Church are received.

It was to be expected that those who should receive the truths of the New Jerusalem, would fail, in some cases, of discriminating properly between the old things which are passing away, and those which the Lord is making anew. Thus we frequently discover some inconsistency in the conduct of those who have embraced these doctrines. While the proper separation between old things and new has not taken place in their understandings and affections, it will not take place perfectly in their lives; but so far as the new heavenly principles are established in the mind, the words and actions which proceed will indicate a similar separation between truth and falsity, good and evil. It must continually become more manifest, that there can be no alliance or fellowship between principles so opposite as those which belong to the perverted Church, and those which are now coming down from heaven, and that those who receive the latter cannot reasonably be expected to abandon them, or make any compromise, out of complaisance or respect to those who receive the former.

We now pass to the main subject of Mr. Ellingwood's pamphlet, or that which its friends have chiefly relied upon to prove the evil tendency of Swedenborg's writings, and thus to arrest the progress of the New Church. It consists of about six and a half pages; and is headed — "EXTRACTS from Swedenborg's Pleasures of Insanity concerning Scortatory Love." Of this part of the pamphlet the author of the "Introduction" says many things, of which the following from the fourth paragraph are a fair specimen.

"The second part [of the pamphlet] unfolds the views of Swedenborg as to *personal* purity. It consists of a series of extracts from his Treatise on *Scortatory Love*; the last of his treatises put into the hands of the young disciple. Most of those, who read these Extracts, will be ready to say that they are not genuine; that no man could dare to recommend, under the sanction of his name, such horrible impurity to mankind. Yet the reader is assured, that the extracts are taken, *word for word*, from the Treatise above mentioned; and, if he will procure that treatise, he will find in it much more of the same gross and monstrous nature. To publish even this, is such an offence against delicacy, as nothing but the necessity of the case, and a sincere desire to expose the impurity of this dreadful system of morals, can justify."

The three last questions, at the end of the pamphlet, are the following:

"Can any man in the possession of his senses believe that Jehovah, in whose sight heaven is unclean, inspired Emanuel Swedenborg to write the monstrous impurity found in the preceding pages?"

"Does that Jesus, who said to his disciples, 'But I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart,' approve of writings which teach the lawfulness of keeping a mistress?"

"Will parents embrace the tenets of a man who enumerates *the conscientious causes of keeping a mistress*? Will they procure such a book for the perusal of their sons and their daughters? a book fit for no society but that of prostitutes, for no place but that *house* which is 'the WAY TO HELL, going down to the chambers of death.'"

The writer speaks of the "*Treatise on Scortatory Love*," as though it were a distinct work of Swedenborg; whereas it is only the latter part of a work which has the following title; "*The Delights of Wisdom concerning Conjugal Love: After which follow the Pleasures of Insanity concerning Scortatory Love.*"

Of the first part of this book, which treats of Conjugal Love, and which comprises four fifths of the whole, the authors of Mr. Ellingwood's pamphlet have said noth-

ing. Their obvious intention was to deter their readers from examining it, by ascribing so horrible a character to the latter part. They should have said at least, that the first part "*unfolds Swedenborg's views of personal purity*;" but so strangely upside down was their way turned in composing this pamphlet, that they have said it respecting their Extracts from the part concerning Scortatory Love.

What do these writers mean by "*this dreadful system of morals*," spoken of in the passage which I last quoted from the "Introduction?" I suppose they refer to what they call a "*Treatise on Scortatory Love*," as containing this *system of morals*. Possibly they refer to the system as contained in all the works of Swedenborg. Be their meaning one or the other, they present their extracts as fairly representing the moral character of New Church principles.

I do not feel authorized to speak of this act of injustice on the part of the compilers of Mr. Ellingwood's pamphlet, in such terms of reprobation as I suppose it really merits. Mr. Ellingwood, at least, had the whole book before him; and thus had the means of doing justly. But it is painful to censure even ordinary acts of injustice and malignity, where the censure of the act will be regarded as personal censure; and I cannot truly characterize this act, without departing from that moderation which I wish to manifest even towards the worst of men. A simple "*nay, nay*," is, however, sufficient for those who desire the truth, and hate falsity. I shall therefore make a short statement of facts, and leave the intelligent and honest reader to judge righteous judgment.

The book from which these Extracts are made, is commonly called Swedenborg's work or treatise on Conjugal Love. Its whole purpose is to promote this love as

an essential principle of the Church ; and 410 pages of the book treat specifically of this love. The edition from which the Extracts are made is the most common in this country ; and it consists of 651 pages Svo. A new and more correct translation is nearly completed and stereotyped, and will soon be published at No. 11 School Street, Boston ; and it may be obtained through any bookseller in the United States. The old edition was first published in America at Philadelphia, in 1796. It has always been exposed for open sale, and has been loaned freely. The reader will perceive that its sale must have been considerable, to render a new edition necessary : and that the demand for it must still be considerable, to authorize the expense of a new and stereotyped translation. Thus destitute of truth is the representation of the pamphlet, that this book is circulated secretly, and cautiously, and with artifice.

After writing the preceding part of these Remarks, and nearly all of what follows in reply to Mr. Ellingwood's pamphlet, except what I have marked with quotations, I received Mr. Hindmarsh's VINDICATION of the Character and Writings of Swedenborg. This book was published in England in 1822 ; and it contains a reply to all, or nearly all, the objections to the writings of Swedenborg, which I have noticed, or shall notice in these Remarks. Mr. Hindmarsh has long been distinguished for his open profession and defence of the Doctrines of the New Jerusalem ; for his frank, explicit, and intelligible manner of stating them ; for his various and extensive knowledge ; and for the excellence of his character. He is now, if living, very far advanced in age ; and he has been too long and too well known, to leave any room to doubt his intelligence or his fairness.

Mr. Hindmarsh has been so well acquainted with the societies of the New Church in England, from their first

establishment, that his opinion in relation to the design and meaning of Swedenborg's treatise which we are now considering, should be regarded as the common opinion in the English societies of the New Church. I have seen the remarks of other English brethren, and am extensively and intimately acquainted with those of my brethren in America, and I say seriously, and after much consideration, that I never saw nor heard of a believer in Swedenborg's writings, who gave a different explanation of Swedenborg's meaning concerning Scortatory Love from what the reader will find presented by Mr. Hindmarsh and myself. I prefer copying a part of his remarks, and mixing them almost at random with my own, that every one who has any fairness of judgment, may be convinced, that *those who receive* the works of Swedenborg receive no such meaning as Mr. Ellingwood and his friends ascribe to them. *Those who reject* them, are not supposed to be in danger of being corrupted by them.

I might copy my reply wholly from Mr. Hindmarsh's Vindication ; and I should think the reply correct and sufficient for the candid reader : but I prefer giving also what I have written, that by different forms of illustrating the same principles, and by exhibiting the agreement of different minds on this subject, — and those too who are known and responsible — I may settle the question as to the validity of the testimony of this anonymous pamphlet.

The following paragraphs are from the Vindication, p. 183. A great part of the book is an answer to allegations made by the Rev. J. G. Pike, a Baptist minister of Derby.

“Mr Pike charges that author [Swedenborg] with giving countenance to fornication, concubinage, and adultery, mere-

ly because he discriminates between the relative degrees of evil, and shows that one kind of vice is less grievous and destructive of happiness than another. This, after all that Mr. Pike has said on the subject, and after all his partial and unfair quotations from the treatise on Conjugal Love, is precisely the state of the question."

And this is precisely the state of the question between me and the authors and friends of Mr. Ellingwood's pamphlet; for, although it does not directly accuse Swedenborg with countenancing each of these crimes, yet by omitting to concede that there is any difference in the degrees of wickedness in such crimes, and by passing the general censure of — *horrible impurity* — and representing the book as *fit for no society but that of prostitutes, for no place but that house which is the Way to Hell*,— and also by other similar remarks, the reader is unavoidably led to the conclusion that, in the opinion of the compilers of this pamphlet, this book on Conjugal Love does directly tend to countenance and encourage all the various forms of unlawful sexual intercourse.

Again, Mr. Hindmarsh says, —

"The Baron lays it down as the very first principle of his work, that love truly conjugal, or the chaste love subsisting between one husband and one wife, originates in the marriage or conjunction of good and truth; that it corresponds with the marriage of the Lord and his church; that it is therefore celestial, spiritual, holy, pure, and clean, in a pre-eminent degree; that it is the foundation of every species of heavenly love and affection, with all their innumerable felicities; but that it is imparted to no others than those who approach the Lord, and live according to his divine precepts; consequently that every deviation from true conjugal love is to be regarded as a departure from the most perfect state of Christian life, either into evil of a *relatively* venial character, such as the apostle John calls '*a sin not unto death*,' or into evil of a more gross and destructive nature, such as the same apostle emphatically pronounces to be '*a sin unto death*,' 1 John v. 16, 17. But as it is not to be expected, that all men should arrive at the high state of purity above spoken of, and it would be the height of cruelty and injustice to condemn with an indiscriminate judgment those, who, by reason of the frailties

of their nature, either cannot or do not come up to the standard here pointed out, the author proceeds to show in what cases the conjugal principle may yet be preserved to a certain degree. This leads him to consider the nature of *permission*, and how far the divine mercy tolerates some evils, with a view to prevent others of greater enormity, according to these words of our Lord, addressed to the Jews, 'Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, *suffered* you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so,' Matt. xix. 8; from which it appears, that by reason of the adulterous propensity of the Jews, or the hardness of their hearts, a law accommodated to their state of evil, was *permitted*, in the place of one more pure and perfect, which doubtless they would have profaned. It is therefore to be well observed, that Emanuel Swedenborg no where *recommends* or *approves* either of fornication or of concubinage, still less of adultery in any of its forms or degrees; but, on the contrary, most strenuously advocates the chastity, purity, and sanctity of the marriage state."

On pages 31 and 32, Mr. Hindmarsh remarks as follows:

"The next charge against Baron Swedenborg is, that with him 'fornication is allowable, and adultery, in many cases, no crime.' This is a most unjust charge, and can only be made by those, who either wilfully or ignorantly misrepresent the author. So far from countenancing and encouraging the evils of fornication and adultery, he expressly condemns them; but at the same time, with that wisdom and discrimination to which his opponent appears to be an entire stranger, he distinguishes between the several kinds and degrees of evil in both the one and the other. On the subject of fornication he writes thus: 'There are degrees of the qualities of evil, as there are degrees of the qualities of good; wherefore every evil is lighter and heavier, as every good is better and more excellent. The case is the same with fornication, which, as being a lust, and a lust of the natural man not yet purified, *is an evil*: but inasmuch as every man is capable of being purified, therefore so far as it accedes or approaches to a purified state, so far that evil becomes a lighter evil, for so far it is wiped away; but so far as it accedes or approaches to the love of adultery, so far it is more grievous.' *Conjugal Love*, 452. He afterwards, n. 453, explains what he means by the lust of fornication acceding or approaching to adultery: 'All fornicators (says he) look to adultery, who do not believe adulteries to be sins, and who entertain like thoughts of marriages and of adulteries, only with the discrimination of what is allowed and what is disallowed' by the laws of human society.

“On the subject of adultery perhaps no author has ever written so amply, so ably, and so expressly in condemnation of that vice, as the Baron has done throughout his voluminous works, particularly in his treatise on *Heaven and Hell*, 384; *Conjugal Love*, 464, 500; *Arcana Cælestia*, 8904; where he observes, that ‘whenever man commits adultery, and feels a delight therein, *heaven is closed against him.*’ But he also discriminates between the degrees of guilt even in acts of adultery, according to the circumstances attending them, justly remarking, that some cases are less aggravated than others; and for this he is shamefully accused of encouraging vice, and giving his sanction to adultery, by the Rev. J. G. Pike, of Derby, a professed minister of the gospel of Jesus Christ; by Mr. Pike, who knows no difference in guilt between simple fornication and the infernal lust of adultery, but confounding together all the shades of crime, the lightest with the most grievous and pernicious, pronounces the same judgment on every kind and degree of evil! To reason with such a man is obviously a waste of time, which might be employed to a much better purpose. If he cannot of himself comprehend so plain a doctrine as that of the equitable distribution of rewards and punishments, according to the degree of merit or demerit in human actions, no arguments will avail so as to produce a conviction of the truth and justice of our Lord’s words in the Gospel, where he saith, ‘That servant, who knew his lord’s will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with *many stripes.* But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with *few stripes.*’ Luke xii. 47, 48. Let these observations suffice for the present, as we shall have occasion to return to this subject again in the course of the work.”

I shall now make such extracts from the treatise itself which is so harshly condemned by Mr. Ellingwood’s pamphlet, as seem to me to present Swedenborg’s meaning in a fair light; and, although there are multitudes of other passages in the book of similar character, I shall give those which are selected by Mr. Hindmarsh, in order to continue the proof that this reply fairly presents the views of the New Church. After giving these extracts I shall introduce the observations which I had prepared before seeing Mr. Hindmarsh’s Vindication.

"Love, considered in itself, is nothing else but a desire and consequent tendency to conjunction; and conjugal love to conjunction into one; for the male and female were so created, that from two they may become one man, or one flesh; and when they become one, they are then, taken together, man in his fulness. But without such conjunction they are two, and each is as a divided or half-man. Now whereas the above conjunctive principle lies inmosty concealed in all and singular the parts of the male, and in all and singular the parts of the female, and the same is true of the faculty and desire to be conjoined together into one, it follows, that the mutual and reciprocal love of the sex remaineth with men after death." *Conj. Love*, 37.

"As few know the distinction between the love of the sex and conjugal love, it may be expedient briefly to point out this distinction. The love of the sex is a love directed to several, and contracted with several of the sex; whereas conjugal love is only directed to one, and contracted with one of the sex. Moreover, love directed to several and contracted with several is a natural love, for it is common to man with beasts and birds, which are natural; whereas conjugal love is a spiritual love, and peculiar and proper to men, because men were created, and are therefore born to become spiritual; wherefore so far as man becomes spiritual, so far he puts off the love of the sex, and puts on conjugal love." *Ib.* 48.

"But no others come into this love, and can be in it, except such as come to the Lord, and love the truths of the church, and practise its goods. The reason of this is, because monogamical marriages, which are of one husband with one wife, correspond to the marriage of the Lord and the church, and because such marriages originate in the marriage of good and truth. Hence it follows, that conjugal love with man is according to the state of the church with him." *Ib.* 70.

"Conjugal love is according to the state of the church, because it is according to the state of wisdom with man, as a principle of life. It may be asked, What is wisdom as a principle of life? In a summary view, it is to shun evils, because they are hurtful to the soul, and hurtful to the public weal, and hurtful to the body. This is the wisdom to which conjugal love binds itself; for it binds itself thereto by shunning the evil of adultery as the pest of the soul, of the public weal, and of the body; and whereas this wisdom originates in spiritual things appertaining to the church, it follows, that conjugal love is according to the state of the church, because it is according to the state of wisdom with man." *Ib.* 130.

"The Christian conjugal principle alone is chaste. Christians, in case they marry more wives than one, commit not only natural, but also spiritual adultery." *Ib.* 142.

"The chastity of marriage exists by a total abdication of whoredoms from a principle of religion." *Ib.* 147.

"Chastity cannot be predicated of those, who abstain from adulteries only from various external reasons. Many believe, that the mere abstaining from adulteries in the body is chastity, when yet this is not chastity, unless at the same time there be an abstaining in spirit. The spirit of man, by which is here meant his mind as to affections and thoughts, constitutes the chaste and unchaste; for hence the chaste or unchaste hath place in the body, the body being in all cases such as the mind or spirit is. Hence it follows, that they who abstain from adulteries in the body, and not by influence from the spirit, are not chaste; neither are they chaste, who abstain from them in spirit as influenced from the body. There are many assignable causes, which make man desist from adulteries in body, and also in spirit as influenced from the body; but still, he who doth not desist from them in body as influenced from the spirit, is unchaste; for the Lord saith, *'that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.'*" Matt. v. 28. It is impossible to reckon up all the causes of abstinence from adulteries in the body only; for they are various according to states of marriage, and also according to states of the body; for there are some persons, who abstain from them out of fear of the civil law and its penalties; some out of fear of the loss of reputation, and thereby of honor; some out of fear of diseases, which may be thereby contracted; some out of fear of domestic quarrels on the part of the wife, whereby the quiet of their lives may be disturbed; some out of fear of revenge on the part of the husband or relations; some out of fear of chastisement from the servants of the family; some also abstain from motives of poverty, or of avarice, or of imbecility arising either from disease, or from abuse, or from age, or from impotence. Of these there are some also, who, because they cannot or dare not commit adultery in the body, on this account commit adulteries in the spirit; and thus they speak morally against adulteries, and in favor of marriages. But such persons, unless in spirit they call adulteries accursed, and this from a religious principle in the spirit, are still adulterers; for although they do not commit them in body, yet in spirit they do commit them; wherefore after death, when they become spirits, they speak openly in favor of them. From these considerations it is manifest, that even a wicked person may shun adulteries as hurtful, but that none except a Christian, can shun them as sins." *Ib.* 153.

"A state of marriage is to be preferred to a state of celibacy; the reason of which is, because it is a state ordained from

creation; because it originates in the marriage of good and truth; because its correspondence is with the marriage of the Lord and the church; because the church and conjugal love are constant companions; because its use is more excellent than the uses of all things of creation, for thence according to order is derived the propagation of the human race, and also of the angelic heaven, this latter being formed from the human race. Add to these considerations, that marriage is the fulness of man, for by it man becomes a full man. All these things are wanting in celibacy." *Ib.* 156.

"The delights of conjugal love ascend to the highest heaven, and join themselves in the way thither and there with the delights of all heavenly loves, and thereby enter into their happiness, which endures for ever; the reason is, because the delights of that love are also the delights of wisdom. But the pleasures of scortatory love descend even to the lowest hell, and join themselves in the way thither and there with the pleasures of all infernal loves, and thereby enter into their unhappiness, which consists in the wretchedness of all heart-delights; the reason is, because the pleasures of that love are also the pleasures of insanity." *Ib.* 294.

"Scortatory love is opposite to conjugal love, as hell is opposite to heaven." *Ib.* 429.

"That the lust of fornication is not the lust of adultery, every one sees clearly from common perception. What law and what judge imputes a like criminality to the fornicator as to the adulterer? The reason why this is seen from common perception is, because fornication is not opposite to conjugal love, as adultery is. In fornication conjugal love may lie stored up within, as what is spiritual may lie stored up in what is natural; but the libidinous and obscene love of adultery is opposite to conjugal love, and destructive thereof." *Ib.* 449.

"There are two kinds of concubinage, which differ exceedingly from each other, the one conjointly with a wife, the other apart from a wife. The former is illicit to Christians, and detestable; the latter, when engaged in from causes legitimate, just, and truly conscientious, is not so." *Ib.* 483, 464, 467.

"Among the legitimate causes for separation the Baron ranks vitiated states of the body; but by these he does not mean 'accidental diseases, which befall one or other conjugal partner within the time of their marriage, and pass away, but inherent diseases, which do not pass away.'" *Ib.* 252.

"There are four degrees of adulteries, which, from the nature of circumstances and contingencies, are to be reputed milder or more grievous. A man, from rational conviction,

according to circumstances and contingencies, may absolve a person whom a judge, whilst he sits in judgment, cannot absolve from the law; and also a judge may absolve a person, who after death is condemned. The reason is, because a judge gives sentence according to actions done; whereas after death every one is judged according to the intentions of the will and thence of the understanding, and according to the confirmations of the understanding and thence of the will. These intentions and confirmations a judge doth not see; nevertheless each judgment is just, one for the sake of the good of civil society, the other for the sake of the good of heavenly society." *Ib.* 485.

"Various circumstances exist in the world, which mitigate and excuse crimes, also which aggravate and charge them upon the perpetrator: nevertheless imputations after death take place, not according to circumstances which are external of the deed, but according to internal circumstances of the mind; and these are viewed according to the state of the church with every one; as for example, a man, who hath no fear of God, nor love of his neighbor, and consequently no reverence for any sanctity of the church, after death becomes guilty of all crimes which he did in the body, nor is remembrance had of his good actions, inasmuch as his heart, from whence as from a fountain those things flowed, was averse from heaven, and turned to hell. In order that this may be understood, I will relate an arcanum: Heaven is distinguished into innumerable societies, in like manner hell from an opposite principle; and the mind of every man, according to his will and consequent understanding, actually dwells in one society, and intends and thinks in like manner with those who compose the society. If the mind be in any society of heaven, it then intends and thinks in like manner with those who compose that society; if it be in any society of hell, it intends and thinks in like manner with those who are in the same society; but so long as man lives in the world, so long he migrates from one society to another, according to the changes of the affections of his will and of the consequent thoughts of his mind; but after death his peregrinations are collected, and from the collection thereof into one a place is allotted him, in hell if he be evil, in heaven if he be good. Now whereas all in hell are influenced by a will of evil, all are viewed there from that will; and whereas all in heaven are influenced by a will of good, all are viewed there from that will: wherefore imputations after death have place according to the quality of every one's will and understanding. The case is similar with scortations, whether they be fornications, or pellicacies, or concubinages, or adulteries, inasmuch as

those things are imputed to every one, not according to the deeds themselves, but according to the state of the mind in the deeds ; for deeds follow the body into the tomb, whereas the mind rises again." *Ib.* 530.

The observations on this subject which I had prepared, may seem to be unnecessary after so full a refutation of the false and mischievous representations of Mr. Ellingwood's pamphlet. If the reader so judges, he is at liberty to pass over them.

By scortatory love Swedenborg says is meant the "opposite of conjugal love, viz. the love of adultery." This is a point of the utmost consequence to be attended to in forming a right judgment of this part of the book. Not only in this, but in all his writings, he describes conjugal love as *good*, and scortatory love as *evil*; the former as agreeable to the divine precepts — the latter as opposite to them ; the former as truly a heavenly love, flowing into the soul from heaven, — the latter as truly an infernal love, flowing into the soul from hell.

Of good affections which are modifications of conjugal love, there are many varieties. They are not all equally pure and elevated, but are good in different degrees. Still they are all good, and do result from, and constitute members of, that new heavenly kingdom, which the Lord forms in the minds of those who are being regenerated. The same may be said of the quality of those actions which flow from these affections.

Of evil affections which are modifications of scortatory love, there are also many varieties. They are not all equally impure and base, but are evil in different degrees. Still they are all evil, and do result from, and constitute members of, that old hellish kingdom which is hereditary in every man, and is in conjunction with hell, and does receive the inverted life of hell, and is confirmed and enlarged by man's own voluntary evils.

Conjugal love, with those good affections, principles, and practices which flow from it, are treated of in the first part of the Treatise of which we are speaking; and scortatory love, with those evil affections, principles, and practices which flow from it, are treated of in the second part. Through the whole book the opposition of these loves to each other is most distinctly manifested. They are made precisely as distinct, and placed in the same opposition, as heaven and hell.

Now, the pamphlet which I am reviewing gives no idea of these facts. The compiler does not even mention that a part of the work treats of pure conjugal love, nor that the part which treats of scortatory love is not the whole book. He condemns this part in the harsh language which I have quoted, and yet speaks of it as Swedenborg's "system of morals," and as "unfolding his views of personal purity." He wholly omits to show the *opposition* between scortatory love and the love which Swedenborg calls pure and heavenly, except so far as this is indirectly mentioned in the extracts from Swedenborg. All that the pamphlet contains on this subject is directly calculated to give the impression, that Swedenborg allows and encourages the various kinds of impure love. Such, I am certain, is the general impression made by the pamphlet; and the common remarks made by those who have read it, are the proof of this fact. Every reader must see that I state this matter fairly; for this part of the pamphlet would be a mere nullity, unless we suppose it was designed to make this impression, and that those who circulate it to oppose the New Church, suppose this to be its design and true meaning.

To give some idea of the manner in which the New Church discriminate between the degrees of evil in different evil affections and actions, a few observations will here be offered.

Considering men in their fallen state, it is obvious that none are *good*. They have all corrupted their way. There is none *good*, but One. We call a man *good* who resists his evil affections, and lives according to the revealed truth or commandments of the Lord. Thus, we call, or should call, man *good*, only in proportion as he does not his own will, but the will of the Lord; and this is properly to call the Lord *good* and not man.

Human affections and actions are regarded as more or less sinful, in proportion as they are more or less opposed to revealed truth or the commandments, and also according to the purity and elevation of the truths to which they are opposed. In judging of sin in the affections and actions of men, we are therefore led to inquire what truth they have; and this inquiry involves an admission that truth is accommodated to the different conditions of men; and that the same measure of virtue, or exemption from vice, is not, in a legal sense, required of all. This at once brings us to consider the manner in which truth is thus accommodated, and the nature of Divine permissions.

Truth, in itself, is immutable, as its Source or Fountain is immutable; but as it descends into the minds of angels, men, and devils, it is modified by them, and accommodated to their states of reception.

Taking men as they are, in all countries and in all orders of society, and calling them all hereditarily and actually evil, and yet evil in different degrees, we see that Divine truth is accommodated to their various conditions or degrees of evil, and is adapted as it descends to man in each degree of evil, to raise him from that to a higher state. In other words: truth descends to men in their various degrees of separation or spiritual distance from the Lord, and elevates them, or redeems, and brings them

back from greater degrees to less degrees of separation ; and thus it redeems them as fast and as far as they can be redeemed in freedom, and saves them from sin, and conjoins them with heaven and the Lord.

Truth, therefore, is not the same in all the degrees to which it descends : it is accommodated to the states of those to whom it is sent. But when men or devils do not convert truth into falsity, its message is essentially the same to men of all characters and conditions ; — it says to all — *Repent : put away the evil of your doings from before Mine eyes* : And it says to all — *If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow Me.*

To some persons it seems improper to speak of the modification of truth, and its accommodation to persons in different states of mind ; but the propriety of it may perhaps be seen by comparing it with the modifications and accommodation of natural light, as it descends from the sun to the various objects on which it falls. It may be still more obvious from the circumstance, that the light is seen more or less fully, according to the state of the eye that receives it ; and thus that there is to each one, more or less light, according to the state and quality of the eyes which see it. This explanation is designed for those who will be disposed to think that all truth is alike, and to say — *Truth is truth ; — if a thing is true, how can another thing be more true ?*

As truth descends and is accommodated to men's minds, it addresses some in the form of parables, that seeing they may see and not perceive. Truth is thus presented to those who are in a state so confirmed in evil, as to be incapable of reformation, and who would only be made more desperately wicked and miserable, if they saw the truth in its real meaning, because

they would profane it. As it descends to their minds, it is therefore mercifully permitted to appear dark and unintelligible.

To those who are in a less degree of evil, or are less confirmed in evil, truth is accommodated so as to teach just so much as they are in a state to comprehend and *improve*. It teaches them to repent, and how to repent. It does not at first, disclose to them the highest degrees of purity, nor any degree distinctly except that which is the next above their own state. It teaches them to fear becoming more evil, and how to avoid it; and it also shows them plainly what is the next less evil state, and how to shun their present measure of evil and advance to that state. — I do not mean to be understood strictly as saying that this is the exact order in which men are enlightened. Some who are very evil, do understand truth which they will not improve, and hence are made worse by it. But the Divine Providence guards evil men against being thus enlightened, so far as it can guard them and still allow their free agency.

Truth as it thus comes down to the conditions of men in various degrees and kinds of evil, does, at first, exact greater degrees of holiness or purity of some, than of others; but its end with each one is the same. It teaches each one to *rise*; and having taught him and enabled him to rise *one* degree, it teaches and enables him to rise *another* degree. It indulges less evils to prevent greater; and teaches man continually that, although he can never become absolutely *good*, yet he can shun evils, and receive good from the Lord. And by shunning the evil actions to which his present evil affections lead, he will continually advance in the work of repentance and reformation, provided he shuns them because they are sins against God.

To the Jews many laws and permissions were given, not because they were right or orderly in themselves, but because the state of Jewish minds required them. They could not receive purer truths or precepts of life. Because of the hardness of their hearts Moses wrote those things. Such were the laws respecting sacrifices, and some of the laws respecting retaliation. Such also were the permissions concerning concubinage, and putting away their wives for slight causes. See Matt. xix. 3—12.

Without proceeding farther with this view, I say that Divine truth, in that degree of it which descended to the Jewish state of character, required a less degree of purity than it requires of angels, or of any men who are elevated in any degree above Jewish character. Or if this language be regarded as objectionable, I will give the idea a more extended and definite form : —

Although Divine truth is in itself immutable, and requires that all men should be perfect even as their Father who is in heaven is perfect, yet in descending to men of various degrees of grossness and impurity, it assumes such forms and appearances as are accommodated to their condition ; and in its state of accommodation to the condition of every person, it requires of him less, for the time, than it requires of any one who is in a higher state. But one degree of obedience to it only prepares for a higher and purer form of it, and corresponding obedience ; and the end of this course of drawing near to the Lord, is that *perfection* towards which the children of God will advance forever. After this manner truth was accommodated to the Jews ; and because of the hardness of their hearts, it gave them many permissions and indulgences, and even requirements, which were not agreeable to the Divine will, or to Divine truth in its purity.

This statement may, perhaps, be generally admitted to be true ; but the grand question concerning which many persons will differ from Swedenborg, is — whether any such accommodation is allowed by the Christian dispensation.

In relation to this, I think the Lord's own instructions were, according to His own words, thus accommodated. As examples, — He spake to them in parables, and gives the reason for it, Luke viii. 10, and other places : Also in the text already referred to, Matt. xix. after explaining that the law authorizing the Jews to put away their wives, was only an accommodation to the hardness of their hearts, and hence not agreeable to the order of pure truth, — and after the Pharisees had said that if it were not lawful to put away wives except for fornication, it was better not to marry, He answered that the truth which He had then taught was not accommodated to the condition of all, and that all could not receive it : — “ *All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given : He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.* ”

This last example appears to me so directly in point, and to meet the present subject so fully, that no other examples seem necessary. But as the subject is of great importance, I think proper to dwell upon it a little longer. That the Apostles regarded truth as thus accommodated to the various states of men, is everywhere obvious in their Acts and Epistles. As a case in point I shall refer to Paul's opinion of *marriage* and *celibacy*. It has been a very common opinion in the Christian church, that he regarded *celibacy* as the more holy state. I suppose that he did so regard it ; but this is not essential to the use I have to make of his remarks and advice in 1 Corinthians, vii. Whether he had reference only to the state of things then existing, or generally to all states, he did rep-

resent it as better not to marry, because an unmarried person could, he thought, be more without carefulness, and could be more fully devoted to the service of the Lord. On this ground he recommended to men and women to remain single, *if they felt able*; but if they did not feel able, — “*if they could not contain*” — he advised them to marry, because “*it is better to marry, than to burn.*” Such is a sample of Paul’s opinions respecting the accommodation of the Divine requirements to the different states of men.

This principle is also involved in the remarks of John in his first Epistle, concerning *sin*. He defines *sin* to be, *the transgression of the law*; and he then makes a distinction between some sins and others; speaks of “sin that is unto death,” and “sin that is not unto death;” and teaches that those who commit the latter, are to be prayed for and assisted, that they may rise above it and put it away. Hundreds of similar examples might be cited, in which the Apostles acknowledged and acted upon this principle.

The reader is desired to bear in mind, that all *DUTY* is revealed, pointed out, or commanded by *TRUTH*. Nothing is a *duty* which is not thus revealed; — and, as I have already stated, *duty* is revealed more or less fully — or *more duty* is revealed, according to the elevation of men’s understandings and affections. And even when duty is made known to the mind by truth, more or less fullness and perfection of obedience is required by the Lord, according to the state of men’s minds. *He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.* Thus the disciples of the Lord are in some degree excused from that watchfulness and prayer which are necessary to avoid temptations, because *the flesh is weak.* Matt. xxvi. 41.

The principle which I am illustrating is also taught in all those texts, which teach that the Divine requirements

are according to what men have, and not according to what they have not; and the *having* which is here alluded to, implies not only *knowing* the truth, but such a state of reception of the truth, as gives ability to *obey* it.

Men of every religious sect act on this principle, so far as they follow the Lord, in judging of their fellow men. Who is there, who is regarded as judging fairly, that does not make *allowance* and *excuses* for his neighbor on account of his strong hereditary propensities to certain evils, — his bad education, — his long habits of sin before he commenced reformation, — the short time that he has had for reformation since he commenced it — and on many other considerations. And where is the wrong of saying to our neighbor, “My friend, you are greatly immersed in evil, and are sadly enslaved by it. You can, however, do better than you are accustomed to do: You can avoid the present gross degree of your evil, and do thus and so to mitigate it, and elevate yourself above your present state, even if you cannot avoid the whole evil; and by such improvement you will be prepared for still greater reformation, and will avoid sinking lower: *Do as as well you can*; and if you cannot be perfect, or rise at once even to the purity of the best of men, yet *rise as much as you can*, and *keep on rising*.”

I cannot venture to expect that this principle will not be controverted by those who believe in complete and instantaneous regeneration, or that evil is wholly removed from the soul when its outlets are forcibly closed; but if any man who voluntarily tries to reform his character by shunning evil as sin, or to lead his neighbor to such reformation, will look at his own efforts to this end, and the manner in which the Lord leads from one degree of reformation to another, he will find that he practically admits this principle in its full extent, and

that he cannot take even one step in religious life without it.

I now turn to the Extracts in Mr. Ellingwood's pamphlet concerning Scortatory Love. The reader will recollect, that at the end of these, one of the authors, (I know not which,) calls the treatise from which he made the Extracts — "a book fit for no society but that of prostitutes, for no place but that house which is the **WAX TO HELL**, going down to the chambers of death."

Now, strange as it may seem, this remark strikes me as giving much more nearly the true character and design of Swedenborg's Dissertation on Scortatory Love, than any other that these authors have made. Nay, it seems to me to be the only one in which they even blundered upon the truth in any degree.

The work alluded to is fit, and was designed to be fit, for prostitutes, and for all fornicators and adulterers, whether they belong literally to *houses of ill fame*, or to the chambers of the respected, or the closets and conventicles of the self-righteous; — and whether their sins be actual, or only *in the heart*.

The author, however, probably meant to imply, that this work is fit to teach impure persons the way *to* hell; whereas I suppose it is fit to teach the way *from* hell. So, even in this particular, I have not the pleasure of agreeing with him.

As I have already shown, the book first treats at great length of pure love between two of different sexes, whose minds are capable of being united into one. He speaks of the various degrees of this union, and the principles of duty applicable to them. All this relates to *good* love, — love that is to be *recommended, encouraged, and cultivated*.

The last part of the book relates to what is opposite to this pure, heavenly love, viz. to *evil love from hell*. All

men and women have much of this love : it is hereditary. If the education of children be good, the virtuous habits and principles which they thus acquire, do greatly modify this love when it comes forth into exercise ; and if its evil tendencies are resisted when they are manifested, pure conjugal love is received from the Lord in place of this hereditary evil love.

This hereditary evil love is stronger in some than in others ; and in proportion to the want of good education, and to the actual indulgence of this evil love after it springs forth, is the power which it acquires in the soul. Hence it exists in human minds in different forms of affection, and in different degrees of affection or lust, and thus in different degrees of opposition to conjugal love.

Swedenborg discriminates between these various kinds and degrees of scortatory love, and shows which are the most, and which are the least evil. He also discriminates between the various kinds of evil acts or practices, which result from these various evil affections ; and he recommends that, *if they cannot contain*, they should do those which are less gross and injurious, rather than those which are most so. Still, he represents the whole as on the side of evil — as resulting from man's depravity — and as not to be recommended or indulged on account of any good there is in them.

Some men, and indeed many, who have some good principles, and do make some sincere and successful efforts to shun evil as sin, find in themselves a sad mixture of evil principles and affections with their good ones ; and so bad is the case of many, that they cannot at once either put away or control all their evil affections, but *when they would do good, evil is present with them*. But whatever may be the evil affections and evil practices of such persons, they may all do better than they now do :

and if they know how to discriminate between the various kinds and degrees of evil, they can constantly recede from the present state of their affections and conduct, to what is less evil. If, in so doing, they act from a sincere desire to put away evil because it is sin against the Lord, and contrary to the truths of His Word, they are not going in the way *to* hell, but in the way *out of* it.

To lead the evil in this manner, is truly the very design of that part of Swedenborg's work which relates to Scortatory Love ; and the members of the New Church believe that it is adapted to this end. The proper witnesses in this case are those who think well of this work—who believe it, and study it, and apply it to their lives so far as they find any parts of it suited to their particular states of character. Regarding these as the proper witnesses in relation to the *tendency* of this work, I have inquired of many, of different characters, respecting its effects on their minds. I ask questions like the following, — Did this book ever seem to encourage or allow you, to become more unchaste than it found you? — to justify you in *descending* to less degrees of purity in affection, thought, deed, or word ; or even in remaining in so low a state as you were? The answer has been, and must ever be, that however chaste or unchaste it finds a person, it teaches and requires him to *ascend*, but never to *descend*. Of their improvement under this guidance, I say nothing.

In relation to Swedenborg's classification of the various kinds and degrees of impure love, and of corresponding actions, I have no farther defence to make. Those who object to the book, do not inquire into the correctness of this classification, but pass an indiscriminate censure, to which I have replied.

I suppose that Swedenborg was properly instructed on

this subject ; and I know that I am very ignorant, and others are so also. We are too much in the habit of regarding every sin of any particular class, as equally great. It is not, however,[§] difficult to see that this is wrong ; but it is difficult for those of ordinary illumination to classify and describe them properly. I suppose that Swedenborg has done this. In a few cases it has seemed to me and to some of my brethren, that evils which he calls *less* than certain others, are not obviously *less*. But we suppose this results from the imperfect degree in which we possess the *opposites* of these evils, which would enable us to discriminate justly.

I can easily conceive that those who do not receive the writings of Swedenborg, should differ from him very much in their judgment respecting the various classes of evils. For this I should not blame them ; they will agree with him better when they are wiser. But, that they should invert the whole design of this book, and give the impression that Swedenborg attempts to annul the evil of any degree of unchastity or impurity, is not excusable, even with the apology, that they “ had the glory of God in view.”

There are other things in this pamphlet which I have not noticed, that I regard as objectionable ; and I shall have occasion once more to refer to this principal subject ; but for the present, the attention of the reader shall be directed to the Second Pamphlet.

REMARKS ON THE SECOND PAMPHLET.

WE come now to another pamphlet, and shall have occasion to name it after the Rev. Bennet Tyler, D. D. of Portland, Maine. It has the following title :

“Remarks of Rev. John Wesley, on the Character and Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg.”

No part of this pamphlet tells by whom it was brought forward. It follows, as far as was convenient, after the example of Mr. Ellingwood's pamphlet that appeared twelve years ago. The proper responsibility for sending it before the public, is shifted off upon a man who died about forty years ago. I know no sufficient excuse for this, unless he or they who adopted this device, believed the common error about our conversing with the *dead* ; and thence inferred that we could bring to justice the dead author of this scandal and falsehood, as well as a living endorser. However this may have been, the pamphlet does not tell where, nor when, nor by whom it was printed.

As I declined answering the former as an anonymous pamphlet, I shall be expected to measure the same justice to this ; and every reader will probably admit, that those who have revived this scurrilous stuff after it had

lain in its grave for fifty years, are as much in fault as though they were its authors.

This Second Pamphlet was published at Portland in May, 1832. This appears from an advertisement of David Buxton, dated May 23d and inserted in the Maine Wesleyan Journal of May 24th, 1832. It was advertised in the Portland Courier also for several weeks.

The reader would infer from these facts, and from its being originally a work of Mr. Wesley, that the Wesleyan Methodists were doubtless responsible for this attack. This is certainly the outside appearance; but I am greatly deceived if the Methodists were not placed in the front rank by those who preferred the old style of secret attack.

It was published by subscription, and the name of Bennet Tyler is the first on the list. The person who obtained the subscriptions, carried with him a recommendation of the pamphlet from Dr. Tyler. The publisher was not at liberty to give the name of the printer, nor to show the subscription paper; but I have good reason for supposing that it was printed by Arthur Shirley of Portland. It has been very difficult to obtain these facts; and it is possible that I may have failed of correct information in some of the particulars. Those who should have stated the whole to the public, were not willing to answer any questions respecting the manner in which the pamphlet was brought forward. It does not appear from any facts that I can obtain, that the Methodists took any active part in bringing it forward.

By thus showing that this pamphlet probably sprang up in the same orthodox soil with the former, I do not mean to imply that the Methodists have less aversion to the doctrines of the New Jerusalem, than the Calvinists. I mean only to trace the pamphlet as well as I can, to

him who had the principal or first agency in bringing it forward. I suppose that Dr. Tyler should be held responsible for the sentiments, the assertions, the scurrility, and the falsehoods, which are thus published, and dispersed on the wings of Methodism.

Mr. Wesley's Remarks are dated "Wakefield, May 9, 1782." I believe they were first published in the *Arminian Magazine*. In the first paragraph he gives Swedenborg's account of the Lord's appearing to him, and giving him a commission to teach the Doctrines of the New Jerusalem, and opening his spiritual sight, so that he saw and conversed with spirits. Mr. Wesley then says :

"Many years ago, the Baron came over to England, and lodged at one Mr. Brockmer's, who informed me, (and the same information was given me by Mr. Mathesius, a very serious Swedish clergyman, both of whom were alive when I left London, and, I suppose, are so still,) that while he was in his house he had a violent fever ; in the height of which, being totally delirious, he broke from Mr. Brockmer, ran into the street stark naked, proclaimed himself the Messiah, and rolled himself in the mire. I suppose he dates from this time his admission into the society of angels. From this time we are undoubtedly to date that peculiar species of insanity which attended him, with scarce any intermission, to the day of his death."

In reply to this, I give Mr. Hindmarsh's statement.

"Mr. Wesley asserts in his *Arminian Magazine* for August, 1783, p. 438, that he was informed by one Mr. Brockmer, of London, and also by Mr. Mathesius, a Swedish clergyman, that Baron Swedenborg, while he lodged at the house of the former, 'had a violent fever, in the height of which, being totally delirious, he broke from Mr Brockmer, ran into the street stark naked, proclaimed himself the Messiah, and rolled himself in the mire.' Being desirous of ascertaining the truth or falsehood of this story from Mr. Brockmer's own mouth, I made it my business, in company with three other gentlemen now deceased, to wait upon him at his apartments in Fetter Lane, and to ask him whether he had ever communicated to Mr. Wesley, or to any other person, such information as above stated, at the same time showing him the different Numbers of

the Magazine, in which the reports published by Mr. Wesley were contained. After hearing the passages read, Mr. Brockmer without hesitation denied the fact, positively declaring 'that he had never opened his mouth on the subject to Mr. Wesley, nor had he ever given such an account to any other person;' and he seemed much displeased, that Mr. Wesley should have taken the liberty to make use of his name in public print, without his knowledge or consent. 'Baron Swedenborg (said he) was never afflicted with any illness, much less with a violent fever, while at my house; nor did he ever break from me in a delirious state, and run into the street stark naked, and there proclaim himself the Messiah, as Mr. Wesley has unjustly represented. But perhaps he may have heard a report to that effect from some other person; and it is well known, that Mr. Wesley is a very credulous man, and easily to be imposed upon by any idle tale, from whatever quarter it may come.'

"I then put the following question to Mr. Brockmer: 'Supposing it to be true, that Baron Swedenborg did actually see and converse with angels and spirits, did you ever observe anything in his behavior, that might not naturally be expected on such an extraordinary occasion?' He replied as follows: 'If I believed that to be true, I should not wonder at anything he said or did; but should rather wonder, that the surprise and astonishment, which he must have felt on such an occasion, did not betray him into more unguarded expressions than were ever known to escape him; for he did not say nothing, but what I could easily account for in my own mind, if I really believed what he declares in his writings to be true.'

"It is to be observed, that Mr. Brockmer was one of the people called Moravians, who are by no means friendly to the doctrines of the New Church, as laid down in the writings of Baron Swedenborg. The testimony, therefore, of such a man in favor of the equable and becoming deportment of his noble lodger, and to the silencing of those unfounded reports, to which Mr. Wesley (once an admirer of Swedenborg and his writings, but afterwards an avowed enemy to both,) so hastily and unworthily lent himself, must be received with due respect by every candid and unprejudiced mind.'

"It appears, then, that the report of Baron Swedenborg's having been seized with a fever, in the height of which he broke from Mr. Brockmer, ran into the street naked, and proclaimed himself the Messiah, is totally false. But even supposing it to be true, that he once had a fever accompanied with delirium, an affliction to which the wisest and best of men are subject, what has this to do with the general tenor

of his writings, composed while he was in perfect health? Is the character of a man to be estimated by what he says or does in such a state? Would Mr. Wesley, Mr. Pike, or any other person, wish to be judged in this way? But Mr. Pike says, p. 4, that 'Swedenborg's friends were obliged to acknowledge, that he once called himself the Messiah.' This is not true; his friends (and I well know to whom the writer alludes under that name) never made any such acknowledgment: and Mr. Pike, with all the assistance he can derive from the anonymous author whom he quotes, is challenged to bring proof of the assertion.

"Mr. Brockmer died a few months after he made the declaration above recited; but the Peruke-maker alluded to by Mr. Wesley, namely, Mr. Richard Shearsmith, who lived in Cold Bath Fields, Clerkenwell, and at whose house Swedenborg afterwards lodged and died, survived Mr. Brockmer many years. Him also I well knew, and have often had occasion to speak to him of the character, habits, and manners of the Baron; and he uniformly gave the most unequivocal and honorable testimony concerning him, both with respect to the goodness of his heart, and the soundness of his understanding. He declared himself ready to attest (upon oath, if required,) that 'from the first day of his coming to reside at his house, to the last day of his life, he always conducted himself in the most rational, prudent, pious, and christian-like manner; and he was firmly of opinion, that every report injurious to his character had been raised merely from malice, or disaffection to his writings, by persons of a bigoted and contracted spirit.' Mr. Shearsmith has been dead now for some years. I saw him not long before his death; and he continued to bear the same testimony, which he had so often repeated in my hearing during the course of the thirty years that I had known him.

"The other person, whom Mr. Wesley names as having given him the same information as Mr. Brockmer had done, was Mr. Mathesius, a Swedish clergyman. Of the credit due to this Mathesius, the following extract of a letter from Christopher Springer, Esq. a Swedish gentleman of distinction then resident in London, and the intimate friend of Baron Swedenborg, will enable the reader to form a just and correct estimate. Speaking of the Baron's death, he observes, 'When the deceased found his end approaching, and expressed a wish to have the communion administered to him, somebody present at the time proposed sending for Mr. Mathesius, the officiating minister of the Swedish church. This person was known to be a *professed enemy* of Baron Swedenborg, and had set his face against his writings. It was *he* that had

raised and spread the false account of Baron Swedenborg's having been deprived of his senses. Baron Swedenborg therefore declined taking the sacrament from him, and actually received it from the hands of another ecclesiastic of his own country, named Ferelius, who at that time was a reader of Baron Swedenborg's writings, and is said to have continued to do so ever since, at Stockholm, where he is now living (in 1786); and I have been assured, that, on this occasion, Baron Swedenborg expressly exhorted him 'to continue steadfast in the truth. Mr. Mathesius is said to have become insane himself, a short time after this; and becoming thereby incapable of his function, has existed ever since, in that melancholy state, upon the bounty of the King of Sweden.' — *Vindication*, pp. 15 to 19.

Why did not Dr. Tyler and his friends use so much fairness as to inquire whether there was any proper reply to this scandalous falsehood, before they published it, and dispersed it with the four winds? He is far from being ignorant that there is a little society of the New Church in Portland; nor is he ignorant of its members. If he had asked them for information, he would have obtained the very book from which I have quoted; for I sent to Portland and obtained it from one of his neighbors? I believe that literary men do not consider it proper to propagate foolish and scandalous statements, when correct information can be easily obtained. Was it fair, honorable, and like a Christian, for Dr. Tyler to put forth this calumny in a clandestine manner, without inquiring whether the statement was true or false? Does he take it for granted, that every evil thing that is reported against the New Jerusalem, is true? I hope not; because the disposition to believe falsehoods, is nearly allied to that of making them.

As so much reliance is placed on Mr. Wesley's opinions concerning Swedenborg, it may be proper to give some farther account of their origin, progress, and changes. I shall therefore make a long and interesting quotation from Mr. Noble's "Appeal in behalf of the

Doctrines of the New Jerusalem." This useful work might also have been easily obtained by Dr. Tyler and his associates. I shall copy from the Boston edition, pp. 131 to 135.

"It has given much pain to the receivers of the doctrines communicated in the writings of Swedenborg, that the circulation of the report of his insanity, should have been materially promoted by a man so much entitled to respect as the late Rev. Mr. Wesley. It is however certain, that in the part which he took in the affair, he was completely imposed upon by the Minister of the Swedish Chapel in London, Mr. Mathesius, who was Swedenborg's personal and violent enemy; — and I am providentially enabled, by some documents which have recently come into my hands, to trace the progress of Mr. Wesley's mind in regard to Swedenborg, in such a manner, as completely to neutralize his authority in the unfavorable conclusion which he, at last, adopted: for I am enabled to show, that, in that conclusion, Mr. Wesley stands in direct opposition to Mr. Wesley himself; and that his first judgment was formed upon far better evidence than his last. It appears certain, that Mr. Wesley was at one time inclined to receive Swedenborg's testimony in the fullest manner; and this *because he had had indubitable experience of his supernatural knowledge.*

"Among Mr. Wesley's preachers, in the year 1772, was the late Mr. Smith, a man of great piety and integrity, who afterwards became one of the first ministers in our church. Having heard a curious anecdote said to rest on his authority, I wrote to Mr. J. I. Hawkins, the well known Engineer, who had been intimately acquainted with Mr. Smith, to request an exact account of it. The following (a little abbreviated) is his answer: it is dated February 6th, 1826.

"Dear Sir, — In answer to your inquiries, I am able to state, that I have a clear recollection of having repeatedly heard the Rev. Samuel Smith say, about the year 1787 or 1788, that in the latter end of February, 1772, he, with some other preachers, was in attendance upon the Rev. John Wesley, taking instructions and assisting him in the preparations for his great Circuit, which Mr. Wesley was about to commence: that while thus in attendance, a letter came to Mr. Wesley, which he perused with evident astonishment: that, after a pause, he read the letter to the company; and that it was couched in nearly the following words: [the letter was most probably in Latin; but Mr. Wesley, no doubt would read it in English:]

Great Bath Street, Cold Bath Fields, Feb. — 1772,

‘Sir, — I have been informed in the world of spirits that you have a strong desire to converse with me; I shall be happy to see you if you will favor me with a visit.

‘I am, sir, your humble servant,

‘EMAN. SWEDENBORG.’

“‘Mr. Wesley frankly acknowledged to the company, that he had been very strongly impressed with a desire to see and converse with Swedenborg, and that he had never mentioned that desire to any one.

“‘Mr. Wesley wrote for answer, that he was then closely occupied in preparing for six months’ journey, but would do himself the pleasure of waiting upon Mr. Swedenborg soon after his return from London.

“‘Mr. Smith further informed me, that he afterwards learned from very good authority, that Swedenborg wrote in reply, that the visit proposed by Mr. Wesley would be too late, as he, Swedenborg, should go into the world of spirits on the 29th day of the next month, never more to return.

“‘Mr. Wesley went the Circuit, and on his return to London, [if not, as is most probable, before,] was informed of the fact, that Swedenborg had departed this life on the 29th of March preceding.

“‘This extraordinary correspondence induced Mr. Smith to examine the writings of Swedenborg; and the result was, a firm conviction of the rationality and truth of the heavenly doctrines promulgated in those invaluable writings, which doctrines he zealously labored to disseminate during the remainder of his natural life.

“‘That Mr. Smith was a man of undoubted veracity, can be testified by several persons now living, besides myself; the fact therefore that such a correspondence did take place between the Honorable Emanuel Swedenborg and the Rev. John Wesley, is established upon the best authority.

“‘On referring to Mr. Wesley’s printed journal it may be seen, that he left London on the first of March in the year 1772; reached Bristol on the 3d, Worcester on the 14th, and Chester on the 29th, which was the day of Swedenborg’s final departure from this world. Mr. Wesley, in continuing his circuit, visited *Liverpool*, and various towns in the north of England, and in Scotland, returning through Northumberland and Durham to Yorkshire, and thence through Derbyshire, Staffordshire, and Shropshire, to Wales; thence to Bristol, Salisbury, Winchester, and Portsmouth, to London, where he arrived on the 10th of October in the same year, having been absent rather more than six months.

“‘I feel it my duty to accede to your request and allow my name to appear as your immediate voucher.

I remain, Dear Sir, yours very sincerely,
JOHN ISAAC HAWKINS.’

“To this I can add, that the Rev. Mr. Sibley has assured me, that he has heard Mr. Smith relate the above anecdote; and that he could mention, if necessary, several other persons still living who must have heard it too. He fully, also, supports Mr. Hawkins’s statement in regard to Mr. Smith’s veracity. Thus it is impossible to doubt that Mr. Smith affirmed it; and it is difficult to suppose that he could either wilfully or unintentionally misrepresent an incident which must have impressed him so strongly, and of which the consequent change of his sentiments formed a collateral evidence.

“It may be here proper to observe, that the Translation of Swedenborg’s little work on the Intercourse between the Soul and the Body had been published not long previously (in 1770,) with a preface by the translator, addressed to the Universities, urging the author’s claims to attention. This Mr. W. had probably seen, and had thence conceived the desire he acknowledges, to see the author. The discovery that this desire, though it had remained a secret in his own breast, was known to Swedenborg, must have affected him very strongly: it must have convinced him that Swedenborg’s assertion, that he possessed the privilege of conversing with angels and spirits, was true: and it is natural to suppose that he would conclude from it, that the cause assigned by Swedenborg of his having received this privilege, namely, that he might be qualified for a holy office to which he had been called, was true also. There is, further, the strongest evidence that Mr. Wesley’s conviction went as far as this. I had some time ago heard an anecdote demonstrating it related in conversation by the Reverend and venerable Mr. Clowes, Rector of St. John’s, Manchester, whose high character for every quality that can adorn a minister of the gospel, and of course for veracity among the rest, is acknowledged by all who know him (and few are known through a wider circle — by those who differ from him as well as by those who agree with him in theological sentiment;) I therefore lately wrote to him to request a written statement of the particulars, with leave to publish it with his name; with which request he kindly complied. The part of his letter (dated January 19, 1826) which relates immediately to this subject, is as follows:

“‘My very dear Sir, — In full and free compliance with your wishes, as expressed in your kind favor of the 16th, I send you the following Memoir of the late Mr. Wesley, as

communicated to me by my late pious and learned friend, Richard Houghton, Esq. of Liverpool, who was also intimately acquainted with Mr. Wesley, insomuch that the latter gentleman never visited Liverpool without passing some time with Mr. Houghton. As near as I can recollect, it was in the spring of the year 1773 that I received the communication, one morning, when I called on Mr. Houghton at his own house, and at a time too, when the writings of the Hon. E. S. began to excite public attention. These writings were at that time unknown to myself, but not so to my friend Mr. Houghton, who was in the habit of correspondence with the Rev. T. Hartley on the subject, and was very eager to make me acquainted with them. Accordingly, in the course of our conversation, my friend took occasion to mention the name of Mr. Wesley, and the manner in which he, on a late visit to Liverpool, had expressed his sentiments on those writings. "We may now (said Mr. Wesley) burn all our books of Theology. God has sent us a teacher from heaven, and in the doctrines of Swedenborg we may learn all that is necessary for us to know."

"The manner in which Mr. Wesley here expressed himself was strong indeed; so much so, that were it not certain that his mind must have been at that time under a very powerful influence in Swedenborg's favor he might be suspected to have spoken ironically. This I observed in my letter to Mr. Clowes; to which he replies, 'I can hardly conceive, from the manner in which it was expressed by Mr. Houghton, that irony had anything to do with it;' and Mr. Houghton must have known with certainty whether it had or not. But an examination of dates will show, that Mr. Wesley's statement to that gentleman was made while the impression from Swedenborg's supernatural communication was acting in all its force. Mr. Clowes' interview with Mr. Houghton was in the spring of 1773: Mr. Wesley does not appear to have been at Liverpool between that time and the 10th of the preceding October, when he returned from his last great circuit. In that circuit he did visit Liverpool, and was there early in April, 1772. This then must be the 'late visit' mentioned by Mr. Houghton; and this was *within six weeks after he had received the extraordinary communication from Swedenborg*. This is certain: and it is also highly probable, that, at the time of his visiting Liverpool, the effect of that communication was greatly strengthened, by the verification of the announcement, which we have seen, Swedenborg had made to him of the day of his own death. He died, as he had announced, on the 29th of March; there can be little doubt that a notice of it appeared in the papers: it would thence, it is

highly probable, be known to Mr. Wesley when he was at Liverpool, about a fortnight afterwards: and the words he then uttered to Mr. Houghton will not appear stronger than he might be expected to use, when two such recent and completely incontrovertible proofs of the truth of Swedenborg's pretensions were operating on his mind.

"Yet Mr. Wesley, thus miraculously convinced of the truth of Swedenborg's pretensions (as far, at least, as relates to his intercourse with the spiritual world,) afterwards exerted himself to check the extension of the same conviction to others! in which, however, he only afforded a proof of Swedenborg's constant assertion, that miraculous evidence is inefficacious for producing any real or permanent change in a man's confirmed religious sentiments. When Mr. Wesley uttered the strong declaration respecting Swedenborg and his writings, he spoke of the latter, rather from what he expected to find them, than from what he actually knew them to be. The probability is, that he at this time knew little more of them than he had learned from the tract on 'the Intercourse:' which contains, probably, nothing that he would except against; especially as it is certain, as there will be opportunity of showing in the next Section, that even the treatise on Heaven and Hell, which gives the main results of Swedenborg's spiritual experience, was not condemned by him. But when he came to find that Swedenborg's writings militated against some of the sentiments that he had strongly confirmed in his own mind; these, which were his interior convictions, gradually threw off the exterior conviction arising from merely outward though miraculous evidence: hence, even before the end of the year 1773, as Mr. Houghton afterwards informed Mr. Clowes, he inserted in his journal a sarcasm on one of Swedenborg's 'Memorable Relations;' and hence he afterwards accepted the false report of Mathesius, and promoted its circulation. Indeed, there can be no doubt that, *then*, such a statement as that of Mathesius would operate as a relief to him; for though he could not receive the whole of Swedenborg's doctrines, the positive proof he possessed of the author's supernatural knowledge must often have disturbed him in his rejection of them: he must therefore have been glad to meet with anything which could make him, with regard to that rejection, better satisfied with himself. Finally, perhaps other causes assisted to strengthen his opposition. When first he published the slanderous report (in 1781,) he still seems to have had some misgivings; hence he prefaced it with the acknowledgment, that Swedenborg was '*a very great man,*' and that in his writings, '*there are many excellent things:*' when he afterwards seemed less

inclined to admit so much, although, no doubt, he still spoke sincerely, a little human frailty, perhaps, influenced his judgment. It is well known that Mr. W. was always prompt in taking measures to put down anything like rebellion among his disciples,— anything that tended to the diminution of his authority over their minds. Now it is a certain fact, that Mr. Smith was not the only one of his pupils who began to think the doctrines of the New Church superior to those of Methodism: among his other preachers who came to the same conclusion, were Mr. James Hindmarsh, Mr. Isaac Hawkins, and Mr. R. Jackson, deceased, with Mr. J. W. Salmon and Mr. T. Parker, still living: all of whom became active promoters of those doctrines: it therefore is not to be wondered at, that Mr. W. at last took the most decisive steps to check their further extension among his flock.

After reading this account it will appear strange to find Mr. Wesley guessing, and guessing so badly, as to the time of Swedenborg's decease. Having mentioned the date of Swedenborg's letter to Mr. Hartley, viz, "1769," he says — "*I think he lived nine or ten years longer.*"

On p. 2. of the Remarks, Mr. Wesley says — "Desiring to be thoroughly master of the subject, I procured the first volume of his last and largest theological work, entitled, 'True Christian Religion.'"

Why should a man of Mr. Wesley's learning make such blunders? And why should his blunders be now repeated by those who can so easily correct them? The True Christian Religion was indeed the *last* work that Swedenborg published; but it is not the largest, nor is it the proper work to show fairly his manner of interpreting the Scripture. The common translation consists of two volumes, 8vo. The Arcana Cœlestia consists of 12 volumes, 8vo; and the Apocalypse Revealed of two larger volumes. There are many other volumes which were then translated, and others in Latin, which so great a reader as Mr. Wesley should have been expected to study carefully, before thinking that he was "*thoroughly mas-*

ter of the subject." It seems that he had *seen* the little work on the Intercourse between the Soul and Body, and the work on Heaven and Hell, and the True Christian Religion; and that he had some knowledge of the work on Heaven and Hell and of one volume of the True Christian Religion. How very little he knew of the true character of either of these works may be easily inferred, when the reader notices that he read them to sneer at them and ridicule them.

This pamphlet is composed almost wholly of such extracts from the two volumes above named, as excited in Mr. Wesley's mind contempt and derision, and of his sneering and contemptuous remarks. If this is the spirit of controversy which Dr. Tyler and the other friends of this publication approve and exercise, we cannot wonder that any doctrine or truth which does not originate with their own party, is "despised and rejected." And they may be very certain that the ground which they thus assume in attacking the New Church, is ground on which we shall not feel authorized to meet them. They will have the field to themselves, and will make only imaginary attacks on the writings of Swedenborg and the Doctrines of the New Jerusalem.

It really seems to me, that this is not the way to prove that the Old Church has not come to an end, and that the Doctrines of the New Jerusalem are not from heaven. It looks so much like the spirit with which the Lord was treated by the Jews, that I cannot but regard it as foreboding the same desolation. I do not, however, expect that the enemies of the Lord's Second Advent will attend to any warnings, but that the things which belong to their peace will be hidden from their eyes.

There are, however, some in every sect, who can see that true religion is not promoted, but is destroyed, by

indulging this bitter and contemptuous spirit even against enemies. And the Doctrines of the New Church, where they have been received and promulgated, have not been found to produce such evil effects on the lives of the receivers, as to make sober and candid persons regard this harsh treatment with approbation. Those only who are heated with party zeal, are found to justify such malignant censure of the principles of any class of men ; and I am ready to hope that even the gentlemen who have brought forward these falsehoods and sneers against Swedenborg and his writings, will yet see the wickedness of such conduct, and exercise proper repentance.

I hope the reader will not have inferred, that I impute the falsehoods of this pamphlet to Mr. Wesley as voluntary and deliberate acts. I know not how he came by them, but suppose that he received them from Mr. Mathesius. Neither do I mean to charge Dr. Tyler and his associates with reviving and propagating falsehoods, *knowing them to be such*. That there are false statements in the pamphlet, and that Dr. Tyler had the means of correct information, and that the whole pamphlet is predicated on that view of Swedenborg which these falsehoods give, must be apparent to every reader. Whether Dr. Tyler and his associates will think that justice demands of them a retraction of these falsehoods, I have no means of judging. But they will now see distinctly why I sought out their names, and thought they ought to be held responsible for repeating Mr. Wesley's assertions.

Perhaps some persons who have not read Mr. Wesley's remarks may read this reply, and think that my assertions respecting the style of this attack require illustration and proof. They may wish to know what I call sneering and contemptuous remarks. The following are a very few out of the number of examples.

"I make no scruple to affirm, this is as arrant nonsense as was ever pronounced by any man in Bedlam."

This is said in relation to Swedenborg's remark — "The Lord is charity and faith in man; and man is charity and faith in the Lord."

Mr. Wesley is dead, and I have no access to him; but I will ask the endorsers of this remark, how they explain the text — "Abide in Me, and I in you?" Does not the Lord abide in man by charity and faith; and does not man abide in the Lord by charity and faith?

But to proceed with the examples: "What heaps of absurdity are here! only fit to have a place in Orlando Furioso." "Blasphemy, joined with consummate nonsense." "Blasphemous nonsense again." "All his folly and nonsense we may excuse; but not his making God a liar; nor his contradicting, in so open and flagrant a manner, the whole oracles of God."

The reader will probably be willing to take my word for the rest. In looking through the pamphlet, I notice occasional attempts to oppose Swedenborg's assertions, by quotations from the Word; but I could not reply to these without first stating Swedenborg's meaning anew, and then defending it. This seems to me superfluous. When a writer comes forward in good humor, and with any fairness of disposition, and opposes the truths of the New Church, I shall suppose that his real purpose is to know the truth, and I shall therefore regard him as a brother, and meet him as a brother. But when one or many individuals assail these truths in the language of blackguard, I cannot meet them on their own ground, nor expect them to come to any ground on which it is proper for a Christian to meet them. And as to those who are liable to be deceived by the spirit and falsity of such statements, I am not aware that I can do them

more good, than by recommending to them to reject such statements as are obviously made from an evil spirit. If this caution be not sufficient, their own affections cannot be regarded as in a proper state to receive instruction. If they love darkness rather than light, they will not come to the light even if it be manifested. On one subject, however, I think a few remarks may be useful. Mr. Wesley says —

“ The most dangerous part of all his writings I take to be the account which he gives of hell. It directly tends to familiarize it to unholy men, to remove all their terror, and to make them consider it not as a place of torment, but a very tolerable habitation.”

The view of future punishment which Mr. Wesley presents as his own belief, makes it wholly arbitrary and vindictive. He does indeed present this principally by quotations from the Word ; but these are given in a manner to show conclusively, that he understood them in a very gross external sense. Thus, in opposition to the idea that hell consists in a state of wickedness in heart and life, — a state in which men eat of the fruit of their own way, and are filled with their own devices, — he quotes and remarks as follows :

“ Tophet is ordained of old : he hath made it deep and large. (God himself, and not man :) The pile thereof is fire and much wood : the breath of the Lord, as a stream of brimstone, doth kindle it.”

He then quotes other texts having a similar literal character, and leaves the impression distinctly, that he believes in a hell of literal fire and brimstone, and punishment vindictively poured from vials of divine wrath.

I have before me an article from Brown's History, which furnishes pretty strong evidence that Mr. Wesley

did not believe in the doctrine of endless punishment. Mr. Noble's Appeal also proves that when Mr. Wesley first read Swedenborg's work on Heaven and Hell, he did not think it a bad book. His mind seems to have been unsettled on this subject. We cannot therefore wonder, that when he was sufficiently excited and angry, to make an attack on this work, he should talk wildly; and I certainly should have regarded his remarks as wholly unworthy of notice, if Dr. Tyler and his friends had not revived them, and thereby sanctioned them.

But do Calvinists and Methodists of the present day really believe in a literal hell of fire and brimstone, and that men are there to be tormented vindictively? I know that some of their most respectable teachers do not believe this; and I seriously doubt whether any respectable man among them would venture to put his name to such remarks on the subject, as this pamphlet presents.

The reader is desired to observe that in the view of hell which Mr. Wesley gives, it is made to proceed from God. We judge of a fountain by its streams: What then do Mr. Wesley and Dr. Tyler make God to be? Do they believe that he is *love*, or that he is *hell*?

Swedenborg's general representation is, that hell consists of the wicked; that they there live wickedly — indulging their various evil affections, passions, or lusts; and that the misery of hell is the natural and necessary concomitant and consequence of their wickedness. Men are not, however, permitted in hell to indulge their various evil passions without any restraint. They are made subject to laws; and for the violation of these laws they are punished. A great part of their misery results from their burning desire to commit more and greater acts of wickedness, than are allowed.

This is the view of hell which Mr. Wesley thinks so dan-

gerous, and which he ridicules and condemns. He is especially offended that Swedenborg represents that fornicators and adulterers are in hell, and that they there live as fornicators and adulterers. He thinks that this takes away the terror of hell torments.

He calls Swedenborg "that filthy dreamer, who takes care to provide harlots, instead of fire and brimstone, for the devils and dammed spirits in hell."

On the same ground he regards this doctrine as worse than Mohammedanism.

"Amazing! So the Christian Koran exceeds even the Mohammedan! Mohammed allowed such to be in paradise; but he never thought of placing them in hell!"

So it seems that Mr. Wesley thought, and that Dr. Tyler thinks, it more impious and absurd to represent harlots as in hell, than as in heaven. I know that men usually judge of these things according to their own states of affection. What a man loves, he is apt to believe is in heaven; and what he hates he is apt to believe is in hell. So, also, he regards that as a state of happiness, where such things as he loves are fully possessed; and that as a state of misery where such things as he hates are fully possessed. But I had hoped better things of Mr. Wesley, Dr. Tyler, and the other subscribers to this pamphlet, than that the terrors of hell would seem to them to be taken away, by allowing there the company of harlots. Indeed, I will not doubt that these remarks were originally made, and have now been repeated, incautiously; and I desire to take no other advantage of them, than to make the opponents of the New Church more prudent in future.

Mr. Wesley does, indeed, first represent that these statements of Swedenborg will have the tendency to make "*unholy men*" regard hell with less terror; but his subse-

quent remarks show plainly that such was his own view of allowing harlotry in hell. He obviously thought that such a hell would be no hell at all.

I will here make a passing remark on the passage from Swedenborg, quoted on p. 15 of the pamphlet, which begins thus :

“Satan was once permitted to ascend out of hell with a woman to my house.”

When Swedenborg saw spiritual beings, he was “in the spirit,” and saw them in the spiritual world. The house in which he then was, was a spiritual house, and not material. Swedenborg shows that those wicked spirits who have become confirmed in the love and belief of falsities, or false doctrines, are called *satans*, or by the general name, *Satan* ; and that those who have become confirmed in the love and practice of evils, or wicked acts, are called *devils*, or the *Devil*. The passage above quoted should have been translated with the indefinite article before *satan* thus, “*A satan was once permitted &c.*” Swedenborg does not teach the common notion, that there is one prince of devils who is called *Satan*. — I return now from this digression.

As to the effect of this doctrine of future punishment on the minds of evil men, I believe that men are now able to be enlightened more than formerly concerning the nature of rewards and punishments. Most persons can probably see that a great change has actually taken place, and is taking place in the minds of men in relation to this subject. Seventyfive years ago (the period when Swedenborg says the Last Judgment took place in the spiritual world) the doctrine which Mr. Wesley presents in his Remarks, very generally prevailed. Now those who openly reject this, are very numerous in every country of Christendom. A large class of these deny all future

misery ; another extensive class limit future misery both as to degree and duration ; and another believe it to be intense and endless, but profess not to know in what it will consist. Among this last class there are continual speculations as to the nature of future misery ; and several are known to disbelieve that it will be inflicted vindictively, and consist in punishment in a literal hell of fire and brimstone.

Thus the Old Church is broken up into fragments as it respects this doctrine, — and I might add, with respect to many others. The minds of most persons reject the old doctrine, as cruel, vindictive, and absurd. I do not, however, think that they are really driven to such extremes as many adopt ; but in this, as in other things, they fail of doing so well as they have ability to do. If, while they see the inconsistency of the old doctrine, they would look more intently at the nature of sin, and carefully endeavor to shun it according to the commandments, I believe their minds would be more open to see the nature of the misery, which is the natural and necessary concomitant and consequence of sin in the present and the future life. Some persons do make great progress in such knowledge, even without any acquaintance with the New Church or the writings of Swedenborg ; and it has ceased to be uncommon to hear sentiments expressed, even in the pulpit, that agree with the doctrine of the New Church concerning future happiness and misery.

Although men are so prone to make hell consist of what they *actually* hate, I believe they are now capable of seeing that it consists rather of what is opposed to the Lord and His Word, and thus of what men *ought* to hate. And whoever will reflect on this subject seriously, and observe the operations of his own mind, and the minds of

other wicked persons, may see distinctly that men have ability to shun evil *because it is evil*, — to shun hell *because it is a hell of evil*. It may also be seen, that when this view of hell, and of the misery of hell, is presented to the mind, the Spirit of Truth accompanies it, and improves concerning sin; and that this doctrine has far greater power to deter man from sin, in the present state of the freedom of his mind, than the old doctrine of arbitrary and vindictive punishment.

After one allusion more to these pamphlets, I shall dismiss them.

It will be recollected that the main purpose and effect of Mr. Ellingwood's pamphlet, was to make the public believe that Swedenborg greatly abated from, or even annulled, the evil of fornication and adultery.

In Doctor Tyler's pamphlet the worst thing that is found against Swedenborg, is that he allows harlotry to exist in hell, and makes hell to consist of this and similar evils!!

How do these two allegations agree? If Swedenborg makes these to be the constituents of hell, is it not making them about as bad as a man could be reasonably expected to make them? — especially when such views as Mr. Wesley's, that this takes away from the misery and terror of hell, and not allowed in abatement? Indeed, I see not what these gentlemen would have. One will not allow us to take away from the evil and the awful consequences of certain crimes: and the other will not allow us to place them in hell, and make them constituents of eternal wickedness and misery.

Some other common errors may properly be noticed, after having given suitable attention to those which are sanctioned by the two popular pamphlets that I have just reviewed.

The first which now occurs to me, is that which represents Swedenborg as making all things *material* in the spiritual world.

Swedenborg teaches that men are in a human form after death : that they have bodily organs and faculties, even more perfect than they had in this world ; that there are in the spiritual world, lands, houses, gardens, trees, mountains, rivers, valleys, animals in great variety, various forms of government, different orders of society, and such occupations as men have in this life. The common impression is, that Swedenborg regarded the various objects in the spiritual world as *material* ; and thus teaches that there are in that world *material* bodies of man, *material* trees, mountains, rivers, &c.

This opinion is wholly erroneous. When John was *in the spirit*, and saw various things in the spiritual world, the things which he saw were *spiritual* and not *material*. Still, they had form and substance ; and were seen with the spiritual eyes as material things are seen with the natural eyes. So it is with those things which Swedenborg describes as in the spiritual world. They are real and substantial, and have organization and bodily form ; but they are not material, nor subject to the laws of material things.

Connected with the preceding error is another, that seems to be very prevalent.

Swedenborg professed to have had his spiritual sight opened, so that he was admitted to free intercourse with persons in the spiritual world from the year 1743 to 1772, the time of his decease. He teaches that, when the Lord pleases, the spiritual sight of any person can be thus opened. All this is fully believed by the members of the New Church.

The common report on this subject, is that Sweden-

borg professed, and that members of the New Church do now profess, to have open, external, material intercourse with spirits : that they do set chairs for spirits and for absent friends at their tables and parties ; that they profess to see spirits with their material eyes, and have social intercourse with them by means of their bodily faculties. This is only a glance at this error : I might fill a large pamphlet with the stories that have been circulated respecting Swedenborg's entertaining spirits, paying for their passage and meals on board the ships in which he sailed, and the stories respecting similar pretensions to intercourse with the deceased, by various receivers of the doctrines of the New Church.

These stories are related with such confidence, that I fear a reputation for veracity much greater than mine will be thought necessary to oppose them. Nevertheless, I shall say *nay*, and those who know me will believe that I speak truly. Swedenborg teaches that such intercourse between those who are in spiritual bodies, and those who are in material bodies, is absolutely *impossible* ; and I never heard of a case in which any member of the New Church pretended to have such intercourse, or to believe it possible. Still, some may say that members of the New Church believe that they have some kind of intercourse analogous to what has been spoken of.

It is difficult to frame a negative that will contradict all the forms which an error may assume. I will therefore, begin with an affirmative, and end with a negative. Members of the New Church *do* believe that when the Lord pleases, He can open the human mind, so as to render spiritual things visible to the spiritual eyes—the eyes that man will see with when his body is dead ; and they *do* believe that such spiritual vision, and spiritual hearing, and feeling, and conversation, have been granted to

many persons. There are many such cases spoken of in the Word : others, that have occurred in the Old Church, seem to be well authenticated ; and we do not doubt that such may have occurred, and that others may occur, with members of the New Church. We do not regard such things as impossible. But among all the stories of this and the preceding class, that I have heard, related by the Old Church and the world respecting members of the New, during the seventeen years that they have been repeating them to me, I firmly believe I can say truly, that they are all wholly false.

It should be distinctly observed, that whenever a person who is in a material body sees a spirit, he sees it by having his spiritual eyes opened. The change is in the person who *sees*, and not in the spirit that *is seen*. According to this principle all the passages of Scripture are to be understood, which teach that men saw the Lord or angels, except those which refer to the Lord while He dwelt in a material body. When He was seen at the Transfiguration, and after His resurrection, He was seen only with the spiritual eyes. The same is true of the cases in which He was seen before He was manifested in the flesh.

It is commonly asserted by the various sects at the present day, that *the Scriptures give us no warrant for expecting any new revelation*. I shall copy Mr. Hindmarsh's remarks on this assertion. See his *Vindication*, pp. 29 — 31.

“ Now, in opposition to this, our Lord expressly says to his disciples, ‘ I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them *now*. Howbeit, when He the Spirit of Truth *is come*, he will guide you into all truth.’ John xvi. 12, 13. Here he evidently declares, that the revelation, which in his divine wisdom he saw was best suited and adapted to their imperfect comprehension *at that time*, would *in some future day* be succeeded by one more distinct and full, when the Spirit of Truth would enlighten their understandings with new

discoveries of his Word and will, which they were *then* incapable of receiving. In another verse of the same chapter he adds, 'These things have I spoken unto you in proverbs: *the time cometh* when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs, but I shall show you plainly of the Father.' v. 25. Here, again, a new and plainer revelation concerning the Father, in addition to that which they were then favored with, is distinctly promised; and we know, that this promise was never fulfilled until the publication of the heavenly doctrines of the New Jerusalem, which teach that Jesus Christ, the Redeemer and Savior of the world, is at the same time its Creator and Preserver, and consequently the Only God of heaven and earth, the Everlasting Father himself. See Isa. ix. 6. Chap. xl. 3, 9, 10. Chap. xliii. 1, 11. Chap. lxiii. 16. John xiv. 9. Apoc. i. 8, 11, 17. Chap. xxii. 13.

"From a variety of other passages, it appears, that the Lord was, in some future day, to come in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory, Matt. xxiv. 30; that is, in his Holy Word, unloosing the seals of its letter, Isa. xxix. 11; and revealing its spiritual sense, Apoc. v. 1 to 9. The prophet Isaiah, speaking of this time, saith, 'The glory of Jehovah *shall be revealed*, and all flesh *shall see it together*.' Isa. xl. 5. 'Jehovah *shall arise* upon thee, and his glory *shall be seen* upon thee.' Chap. lx. 2. And in the Apocalypse it is written, 'The Lord God of the holy prophets sent his angel to show unto his servants the things which must *shortly be done*. Behold, *I come quickly*, and my reward is with me.' Apoc. xxii. 6, 12. 'Write the things which thou hast seen, and the things which are, and the things which *shall be hereafter*.' Apoc. i. 19. 'The temple of God was *opened* in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the *ark of his testament*.' Apoc. xi. 19. 'And after that I looked, and behold, the temple of the tabernacle of the testimony in heaven *was opened*, Apoc. xv. 5. And again, 'I saw *heaven opened*, and behold, a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called faithful and true. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood; and his name is called *The Word of God*.' Apoc. xix. 11, 13. These and many other passages both in the Old and the New Testament clearly show, that some further manifestation of divine truth, beyond the mere literal expressions contained in the Word, was to be communicated to the church on earth, and that such manifestation would in fact be a new revelation of the glory of the Lord.

"The apostle Paul likewise says, that 'the Lord Jesus *shall be revealed* from heaven; that he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe in that day,' 2 Thess. i. 7, 10. But that 'the day of Christ shall be preceded by a general falling away from the true

faith.' 2 Thess. ii. 2, 3. Which agrees with our Lord's words, where he saith, 'When the Son of Man cometh, *shall he find faith on the earth?*' Luke xviii. 8. In like manner the apostle Peter speaks of 'the grace that is to be brought into the church *at the revelation of Jesus Christ.*' 1 Pet. i. 13. In all these cases a future revelation is clearly announced. It is called the revelation of Jesus Christ, not because He will then manifest himself to the world in person, or in an open and visible manner, as some are led to expect, but because He will open the interior sense of his Word, which indeed is Himself, John i. 1, 14, and thereby communicate new light and new life to those, who heretofore were sitting in the shade and obscurity of its letter."

When members of the New Church speak of the first Christian Church as having perverted and falsified all the essential doctrines of Christianity, and hence as having come to an end, it is sometimes inferred that the members of the New Church mean to deny that any others receive and believe any truths of revelation.

This is not a correct inference. We believe that the truths of the New Jerusalem descend from God out of heaven, and flow, in some degree, into the mind of every person in the world, who sincerely endeavors to shun evil, and do good. But the principal and proper medium of these truths, to those who can read and understand, is the Sacred Scripture, explained and illustrated by the writings of Swedenborg. These are not the only means of instruction in spiritual knowledge; but the Lord has given these, and it is not safe to reject, or neglect to improve them.

In conclusion, I beg leave to inquire seriously of those who treat the Doctrines of the New Jerusalem with indifference or derision, whether they have given them so candid and faithful an examination, as fully to warrant the conclusion that they are not what they profess to be—**DOCTRINES REVEALED FROM HEAVEN.** And is it not most prudent for those who have not given these doctrines such an examination, to be cautious as to opposing them, *lest haply they be found even to fight against God?*





JOHN ALLEN

NO. 11, SCHOOL STREET,

HAS LATELY RECEIVED AN INVOICE OF BOOKS FROM LONDON,
AMONG WHICH ARE THE FOLLOWING:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>Arcana Cœlestia, 12 vols. 8vo.
Index to Do. 2 vols. 8vo.
Apocalypse Revealed, 2 vols. 8vo.
Do. Explained, 6 vols. 8vo.
Index to Do. 1 vol. 8vo.
Coronis, or Appendix to the True
Christian Religion.
Internal Sense of the Prophets
and Psalms.
Four Leading Doctrines of the
N. C. 1 vol. 8vo.
Do. do. 1 vol. 12mo.
Hindmarsh's Dictionary of Cor-
respondences.
Do. Key to Numbers, Weights,
and Measures.
Hymns for the New Church, 3d
London edition.
The Astronomical Doctrine of a
Plurality of Worlds, Rev. S.
Noble.</p> | <p>Essay on the Credibility of Swe-
denborg.
Clowes on Matthew.
Do. on Mark.
Do. on Luke.
Do. on John.
Do. Sermons on the parable of
the Ten Virgins.
Do. Two Heavenly Memorialists.
Do. on the Twelve Hours of the
Day.
Do. Mediums.
Improbability of the Destruction
of the Earth.
Brief View concerning Marriage,
&c.
A Plain Statement of what is
taught in the Church signified
(in the Revelation) by the
New Jerusalem.</p> |
|---|--|

AMERICAN EDITIONS.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>Divine Providence.
Divine Love and Wisdom.
Heaven and Hell.
Conjugal Love.
Doctrine of the Lord.
Do. of the Sacred Scriptures.
Treatise on Influx.
Doctrine of Faith.
Noble on the Plenary Inspiration
of the Sacred Scriptures.
Noble's Appeal.
Worcester's Sermons.
Observations on the Growth of
the Mind.
Treatise on the Last Judgment.
The Earths in the Universe.
Concerning the Athanasian Creed.
Divine Love and Wisdom, 18mo.
Brief remarks on the Atonement.
Dialogues on the Apostolic Doc-
trine of the Atonement.</p> | <p>Scripture Doctrine of Regenera-
tion and Good Works.
The True Object of Christian
Worship.
Interpretation of the Parable of
the Unjust Steward.
The Golden Wedding Ring.
Doctrine of Life.
New Jerusalem Tracts, Nos. 1,
2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, together in
cover.
Do. Nos. 7, and 8, together in
cover.
Heavenly Doctrines of the New
Jerusalem.
A Brief Exposition of the Doc-
trines of the New Church.
Nine Queries Concerning the
Trinity, &c.
Life of Swedenborg.
Aphorisms of Wisdom.</p> |
|--|---|